DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 663 SP 019 549

AUTHOR	Emrick, John A.; Peterson, Susan M.
TITLE	School Practitioner Involvement in the Improvement of Practice: Review and Synthesis.
INSTITUTION	Emrick (John A.) & Associates, Los Altos, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE	Nov 80
CONTRACT	300-79-0670
NOTE	117p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; Change Agents; Cooperative Planning; Decision Making; Educational Research; *Inservice Teacher Education; Job Satisfaction; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Development; Research Utilization; *Staff Development; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Participation; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

For this overview of the extent and feasibility of practitioner involvement in professional improvement, practitioners are defined as school-based professionals--teachers, aides, resource specialists, and administrators. Current thought on the need for these individuals to play major roles as decision makers in developing inservice programs is examined through literature reviews and case studies. The first chapter introduces differing philosophies on the nature of inservice and the roles of inservice participants. The rationale for active practitioner participation in inservice programs is discussed in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 offers representative case studies of field-based projects that involved teachers working actively with educational researchers. Chapter 4 surveys practitioner involvement in the delivery and utilization of knowledge. In the fifth chapter, consideration is given to the relationship between school practitioners' level of involvement in decision making and the degree of satisfaction they derive from their jobs. Case studies and analyses are presented of three programs designed to rely upon practitioner involvement in school decision making. The final chapter explores problems that may arise from increased practitioner involvement in professional improvement programs and considers the implications for future trends. A list of references is included. (JD)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

JAE&A
JOHN A. EMRICK & ASSOCIATES

NOVEMBER 1980

SCHOOL PRACTITIONER INVOLVEMENT IN THE IMPROVEMENT OF PRACTICE: REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS

BY

JOHN A. EMRICK AND SUSAN M. PETERSON

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John A. Emrick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PREPARED FOR:

TEACHER CORPS, DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

CONTRACT 300-79-0670

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 019 549

745 DISTEL DRIVE LOS ALTOS CALIF 94022 (415) 948-7944

CONTENTS

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION 1

New Directions in Teacher Education 1

Growth and Collaboration: New Roles for Practitioners . . . 3

Organization of the Report 6

Chapter 2 RATIONALE 8

Knowledge Development 8

Knowledge Use 13

Governance and Decision Making 18

Theories of Job Satisfaction and Achievement Motivation 20

Chapter 3 PRACTITIONER INVOLVEMENT IN THE PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE 29

Knowledge Production through Practitioner Involvement in Research 30

The Action Research Movement 30
Interactive Research and Development on Teaching Project (IR&DT) 31
Teacher Collaborator Program 40
Scottish Education Data Archive 42

Knowledge Production through Practitioner Reflection and Self-Assessment 43

The Triangulation Mode. 44
Reflective Processes Developed at the Prospect School, Archive, and Center for Education and Research 47

Chapter 4 PRACTITIONER INVOLVEMENT IN THE SHARING AND UTILIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE 57

Delivery of Research Results and Products 57

Research on Knowledge Utilization and Improvement-Oriented Change 62

Chapter 5 PRACTITIONER INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING AND SCHOOL GOVERNANCE 73

Akron/Kent State Teacher Corps Project 76

McKinley Complex Teacher Corps Project 83

San Jose Teacher Involvement Project 88

Chapter 6 SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS 100

Anticipated Problems 100

The Plus Side 104

REFERENCES 107

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

New Directions in Teacher Education

Declining test scores, school closings, apparent teacher surpluses, and shifting priorities are among the many factors that have been cited as sources of concern about the quality of teacher education. Preservice programs have been criticized as failing to help prospective teachers develop realistic expectations or to provide them with skills and experiences relevant to the demands they will face in the classroom. Teachers themselves commonly report that the experience of student teaching and their first year alone in the classroom were more influential in shaping their teaching approaches than all their preparatory coursework combined (Lortie, 1975). Similarly, inservice programs have been criticized as tedious, superficial, patronizing, and stultifying. All too often, it is argued, inservice education is based on a remedial model; it is something "done to" teachers to shore up deficiencies in their skills (e.g., Feiman Nemser, 1980).

Along with these criticisms has come consideration of new directions for teacher education. Elliott (n.d.) has contrasted the traditional "bureaucratic understanding" of inservice as a way of shaping teachers' behavior so that it more closely conforms to predetermined specifications with a "professional understanding" of inservice. The bureaucratic understanding aims toward "the technical control of teachers' thought and conduct" (Elliott, n.d., p. 4). It appears mostly as efforts to impose standard and uniform instructional methods and procedures developed outside the school context on professional staff--usually by means of additional courses, workshops, and seminars. These efforts toward staff improvement are often seen by practitioners as oppressive, overly simplistic, regimented, and mostly irrelevant. The efficacy of the bureaucratic view is, at best, questionable.

The professional orientation to inservice, in contrast, regards inservice as: (1) an enabling activity that fosters professional development; (2) a *self-regulating* process of change in beliefs and behaviors; and (3) a *natural* process which will occur spontaneously if externally imposed constraints are removed. The main interest of in-service, according to this view, is in "the professional emancipation of teachers (Elliott, n.d., p. 3). McLaughlin & Marsh (1978) have further suggested that staff development should be viewed as part of program building within the organizational context of the school. Their view reflects five assumptions about professional learning: (1) teachers constitute an important source of *clinical expertise* regarding practice; (2) professional learning is an *adaptive and heuristic* process; (3) professional development is *long term and nonlinear*; (4) professional learning is part of the larger *program-building* process which includes such additional aspects of change as curriculum development and administrative reform; and (5) professional learning is influenced by *organizational factors* in the school and district.

These contrasting views set the stage for this investigation: Namely, what roles can or ought to be made available for practitioners to participate in the shaping of efforts toward their own improvement of practice? In the course of this investigation, we have reviewed a range of issues and approaches associated with more active practitioner participation in both program and professional development efforts.

We define as practitioners the school-based professionals--teachers, aides, resource specialists, and school administrators--who carry out the business of education on a day-to-day basis. Program development is seen as a holistic enterprise, incorporating innovations and improvements in curriculum, methods, and materials of effective education. Professional development is seen as integral to program development; this central thesis is argued and elaborated by most of the writings reviewed in this report. We use the concepts staff development and professional development more-or-less interchangeably, since both signify improvement-oriented changes in educational personnel and school reform.

Growth and Collaboration: New Roles for Practitioners

Two recurring themes in the literature on reform in teacher education are *collaboration* and *growth*. Essentially, growth is regarded as an *aim* or direction which reflects a view of inservice as continuing education and personal as well as professional development rather than as a solution to skill deficiencies. Collaboration, on the other hand, is advanced as a *means* or tactic for improving the quality and relevance of teacher education. The crux of the Teacher Corps program, for example, is collaboration among institutes of higher education, school districts, and communities in the planning and implementation of teacher education. It is assumed that pooling the diverse resources, talents, and perspectives represented across these three stakeholder groups will lead to improvements in teacher education and ultimately in the practice of education in the nation's classrooms.

Both collaboration and growth have implications for expanding practitioners' roles in teacher education. Traditionally, teachers have been on the receiving end of inservice, encouraged or required to attend courses, workshops, and inspirational speeches offered by university professors (Kirby, 1973), for which the teachers were promised some extrinsic reward (e.g., renewal credit, salary increment). Involvement of practicing teachers in preservice programs has been almost exclusively limited to supervision of student teachers, with little effort made to integrate the student teacher's field experience with his or her coursework. The notions of collaboration and growth call for expansion of practitioners' involvement to include more active roles.

Houston (1980) has identified *parity* and *involvement of clients* as essential features of collaboration. In the case of teacher education, the colleges of education (the traditional providers of teacher training) are encouraged to collaborate with practitioners (the clients of teacher education programs). The concept of growth as an aim implies a commitment to lifelong "professional learning that is self-regulated, not engineered by someone else...a belief in the teacher as an active agent in his own learning" (Feiman Nemser, 1980, p. 139).

What forms of practitioner involvement are implied by growth and collaboration? The literature suggests two major roles for practitioners: (1) planner or decision maker; and (2) source of practice-based expertise. As planners or decision makers, practitioners participate in determining agenda--identifying appropriate content, formats, and resources. Arguments have been advanced to support both the collective involvement of teachers in decision making (particularly with regard to inservice education) and the right (and responsibility) of the individual professional to determine his or her own professional goals and agenda for continuing education. Collaboration among teachers, administrators, and university personnel in identifying priorities and formulating inservice agenda was found to characterize effective programs in the Phi Delta Kappa study of inservice education (King, Hayes, & Newman, 1977); reviews by Lawrence (1977) and Howey (1980) also cite teacher input into planning as characteristic of successful staff development efforts.

Arguments that stress the need for the individual practitioner to play a major role as decision maker for professional development are closely related to the notion of growth and lifelong learning as appropriate aims for inservice education. Basically, it is argued that conventional staff development programs tend to treat all teachers as alike, even as they exhort the teachers to respond to individual differences in children. Those who advocate growth and development as the proper aims for staff development stress the individual differences across, for example, teachers at varying stages in their careers (Bush, 1980; Sprinthall, 1980). It is assumed that encouraging the individual to assume responsibility for setting goals and determining the course of his or her continuing education will enable the teacher to pursue a personalized, integrated program (DeVault, 1965). A personalized program designed around the individual's own interests, concerns, and priorities, it is argued, is more likely to promote professional growth and improved practice than is attendance at courses and workshops that reflect no unifying theme and are not generally geared to the individual teacher's current concerns and interests.

Involvement of practitioners as resources for teacher education--that is, as *sources of professional, practice-based expertise*--was also found by Lawrence (1977) and Howey (1980) to characterize effective inservice programs. In independent surveys, both Yarger, Howey, & Joyce (1980) and Reilly & Dembo (1975) found that practitioners rated practicing teachers as the most credible and effective sources of training and expertise. The extent to which practitioners have functioned effectively as trainers and sources of expertise for their colleagues, and the reasons for their apparent effectiveness, are not fully clear. As Lortie (1975), Feiman Nemser (1980), and others have observed, opportunities for teachers to share their expertise with their colleagues are the exception rather than the norm. What literature is available suggests that a combination of factors may be involved.

McLaughlin & Marsh (1978) have suggested that "in terms of knowledge about the practice of teaching, teachers often represent the best *clinical expertise* available" (p. 87, emphasis added). Basically, they argue that educational research has not conclusively proven the value of any particular set of teaching strategies; tightly structured training approaches which may be useful in fields dominated by technology are less helpful in education and other clinical settings. In their evaluation of the National Diffusion Network, Emrick, Peterson, & Agarwala-Rogers (1977) characterized the NDN as an approach to staff development as well as a model for spreading locally developed and externally validated innovations. Among the distinctive features of the NDN's approach to staff development was acknowledgement of *the practitioner as the core of any successful instructional program*--the key resource that could make a program "work". Practitioners provided much of the training in the NDN; instructional methods and materials were not presented as teacher-proof keys to success, but rather as tools that could help the teacher, for example, to individualize instruction.

In addition to the advantages of practice-based expertise and a view of the practitioner as a professional, staff development approaches using practitioners as resources can take advantage of a variety of modes of training, including demonstration. *Demonstration*, or modeling of effective approaches in classroom settings, was found to be an important training mode in both the NDN study and the Rand study of federal programs supporting educational change (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975).

Although the NDN and Rand studies focused mainly on school people working together, many proposals for practitioners to play more active roles in professional development call explicitly for collaboration between school systems and institutes of higher education. The number of collaborative arrangements set up for teacher education is reported to be large and growing (Houston, 1980). However, empirical research on interinstitutional collaboration in education is scarce. The major topics in the extant literature appear to be requirements, obstacles, and questions for future research. As Howey (1980) has concluded, "While the literature is replete with advocates for more collaborative approaches to inservice, it appears that those engaging in such activity have to this point in time encountered considerable difficulty with it" (p. 23).

Organization of the Report

In the remainder of this report, we will attempt to develop, elaborate, and perhaps provide some new perspectives and insights into these issues of practitioner involvement and collaboration for staff development. We will begin with consideration of alternative rationales for undertaking or promoting more widespread school practitioner involvement. We will then report and discuss the current literature on three major areas of practitioner involvement and their apparent staff development implications. These areas are:

(1) Practitioner involvement in research and development of the educational knowledge base;

(2) Practitioner involvement in the sharing and utilization of advances to the educational knowledge base; and

(3) Practitioner involvement in school-based decision making and local governance.

In developing evidence for this state-of-the-art survey, we rely heavily on our field-based case studies as well as an extensive review of the available literature on this topic. Finally, we attempt to synthesize key findings and discuss their staff development implications.

We feel it important to note at this point that the literature on practitioner involvement is sparse and uneven. It appears that this topic has not, until recently, received much serious attention (Fox, 1978). Most of the literature we were able to locate dealt with the role of practitioners either superficially or as a secondary concern to more conventional issues being investigated. This has made the task of connecting issues and findings across investigations both difficult and problematic. Still, we assert that there are patterns which emerge with sufficient consistency and relevance to enable program and staff development planners to benefit from the collective experiences in this important area.

CHAPTER 2

RATIONALE

Arguments for increases in the legitimate and continuous participation of school-based practitioners in the development and utilization of improvements to practice, and in school administrative and governance decisions, have recently emerged from a number of perspectives. Consideration of the research-practice gap has led several theorists to argue that practitioners represent a vital and missing link in the knowledge production process. Recent large-scale investigations of the knowledge transfer process have pointed to the substantial staff development requirements for the adoption and use of most innovations. Several prominent educational theorists have recently argued that the organizational and administrative conventions of school systems isolate practitioners from the communities they serve, and that an effective remedy to the problem of isolation is more active involvement of practitioners in instructional decision making and local school governance. Finally, consideration of practitioner involvement with respect to achievement motivation and job satisfaction theories further reinforces trends toward renewed enfranchisement of practitioners.

In this chapter we will elaborate these arguments and their supporting rationales. It should be noted that, to the best of our knowledge, no strong theory explicitly addressing practitioner involvement and its staff development implications has been formulated. The discussions to follow may represent some first steps toward such formulations.

Knowledge Development

Large-scale educational research is a relatively recent phenomenon in public education. It is only within the last two decades that substantial emphasis and resources have been applied to researching solutions to perceived deficiencies in schools and schooling. Perhaps more importantly, this research has been carried out quite apart from the process of education. That is, educational research agenda typically have been identified and carried out by research professionals, usually located in institutions of higher education, educational labs and centers, or similar agencies. This has led to a concern that both the issues and the products of educational research may lack relevance to school-based practitioners, but that at least part of this problem can be solved by soliciting more active involvement of practitioners in the research process.

Several arguments have been advanced to support practitioners' involvement in research and knowledge production efforts. One of the more frequent is the argument that it will help to close the gap between research and practice by lessening the anxiety and/or skepticism with which practitioners tend to view research (see, e.g., DeVault, 1965; Isaakson & Ellsworth, 1978). This argument assumes that practical experience in carrying out research directly related to the practitioners' own interests will remove much of the mystery surrounding research and help to overcome previous negative experiences and attitudes.

For the most part, researchers and practitioners constitute two very distinct segments of the educational community. Their training is largely separate. They are generally housed in different institutions, and the specialized languages that they speak are different. Researchers' involvement in the educational improvement process has traditionally been in the early stages of curriculum development; as a result, the researchers' contribution is not highly visible to the practitioner who sees only the finished product and perhaps a sales agent or service representative (Krathwohl, 1974). Recognition and rewards do not accrue to individuals in either group on the basis of their contacts with the other group. Isaakson & Ellsworth (1978) report that negative attitudes toward research are common even among students in preservice teacher education programs. They often postpone required courses in research until their final semester and view research courses as having little practical value.

It has been suggested by some (e.g., Tikunoff, Ward, & Griffin, 1979) that giving teachers opportunities to participate directly in formulating research agenda and carrying out investigations on topics of interest to them (usually in collaboration with more experienced researchers) will lead to changes in practitioners' attitudes toward research and in their research-related skills. It is further expected that practitioners who are given research skills and experience will continue to apply their new skills after the period of formal training and collaboration has concluded. In particular, it is assumed that they will be more interested in (and better able to judge the soundness of) research conducted elsewhere and that they will be prepared to conduct scientific inquiry within their own schools and classrooms.

A second argument is that participation on a research team is an enriching professional development experience for the practitioner. In particular, it provides an opportunity for collegial interchange with other experienced professionals from the research and practice sectors of education. The experience is viewed as a means of reducing the effects of "burnout" among teachers who spend the great majority of their working lives in the exclusive company of children, separated from adults who share their professional interests (Bawden, Florio, & Wanous, 1980).

Many proponents of this argument call for practitioners to serve as informants in educational research. The fundamental goal of efforts in this direction is to improve the quality and completeness of knowledge that is added to the research base, particularly with regard to life in classrooms. Feedback of findings and implications to participating teachers, either generally or on an individualized basis, often appears to be of secondary importance. Some of these efforts have been described as "collaborative research". In most cases, however, the traditional division of labor between research and practitioner is retained to a considerable extent. The researcher bears the major responsibility for the design and implementation of the primary research agenda. However, the assumption is made that practitioners possess special knowledge and insights that are not directly available to researchers whose time in the classroom is limited.

Much of the research that makes significant use of input from practitioner informants is basically descriptive in nature. Advocates of this overall approach are generally in agreement that educational research (and researchers) will benefit from a more informed "view of the terrain" and that researchers need to spend more time observing in classrooms and developing an appreciation of the perspectives held by those closest to the phenomena they are studying--i.e., the teachers and, in some cases, the students. Researchers as varied in their orientations as Cronbach (1975), Bussis, Chittendon, & Amarel (1976), Elliott (1977), Tunnell (1977), and Mishler (1979) have all questioned the appropriateness of research approaches that essentially ignore contextual considerations in their search for highly generalizable findings regarding the teaching and learning processes.

At the same time, however, these researchers share a concern with generalizability.* This concern distinguishes them from some early advocates of action research who focused almost exclusively on action implications of their findings for the particular groups studied and who did not suggest that their findings represented a significant contribution to the general knowledge base regarding instructional practices (e.g., Corey, 1948).

A third and related argument is that traditional staff development activities tend to focus on specific teaching skills and use of particular curriculum materials. Involvement in research and knowledge production is viewed as an important alternative that enables practitioners to develop personally and professionally and ideally prepares them to assume greater responsibility for pursuing a lifelong, more integrated, and individualized program of professional growth (DeVault, 1965; Bawden, Florio, & Wanous, 1980). Such a personal sense of responsibility for growth and renewal has been identified by Lieberman (1956), Lortie (1975), and others as generally absent among teachers and as neceesary if teaching is to assume full professional status.

---

*Cronbach (1975) argues that descriptive studies of an educational program or practice should include a variety of naturalistic settings, examining differences across the settings and attempting to trace how uncontrolled factors produce local departures from the modal effect. In this line of inquiry, "generalization comes late, and the exception is taken as seriously as the rule" (p. 125). Tunnell (1977) points to the goal of generalizing findings to naturalistic settings in his argument for carrying out research in naturalistic settings and incorporating practitioners' perceptions of events and behaviors. Bussis, Chittendon, & Amarel (1976) describe their orientation as "neo-phenomenological" because "the extreme form of phenomenalism and existentialism in philosophy assumes a degree of individual uniqueness that would preclude any meaningful generalizations and would thus dictate against psychological research" (p. 12, Note 5). Mishler (1979) recommends that behavioral scientists focus on attempting to specify the conditions under which relationships hold rather than search only for those relationships that apply under a broad range of contexts.

Elliott (1975) has argued that there are fundamental differences between teachers' practical deliberations and traditional, independent research. He has referred to the language of practice as the "language of voluntary action", describing conduct in terms of the intentions, desires, and attitudes it expresses and relating actions or statements to the value systems that teachers hold. Traditional researchers frequently criticize teacher deliberations as lacking objectivity and therefore of little relevance to scientific research. As such, teachers who are invited to participate in most collaborative research are asked to set aside the language of practice and expected to view themselves and their practitioner colleagues from an outsider's perspective. The problem, according to Elliott, is that such approaches do not in fact bridge the gap between research and practice; ultimately their results lack practical significance because they do not take into account the perspectives of practitioners as practitioners and develop theories from this standpoint. Modes of disciplined inquiry are needed that will generate practical theories of teaching.

An alternative in this direction that has received some attention recently involves the notion of the "reflective" or "self-monitoring" teacher, who has made a commitment to continuous observation and reconsideration of practice. As Feiman Nemser (1980) has observed, the notion of reflection as an educational aim is not new: Dewey (1963) defined reflection as "look[ing] back over what has been done to extract the net meanings which are the capital stock for dealing with further experiences" (p. 87). Reflection enables the individual to move experience from the realm of perception into that of understanding, where it can serve as a guide for future action. It is a "process by which one becomes aware of one's situation and one's own role as an actor in it" (Elliott, 1977, p. 5). When applied to practicing teachers, reflection involves thoughtful reconsideration of classroom events and situations to develop insights and understandings that will be useful in the future.

Borrowing a term from Peters (1968), Feiman Nemser has described reflection as a procedural aim--an aim that is conceived in terms of values and principles of procedure rather than in terms of products and outcomes. Procedural aims are translated into process criteria. In the case of reflection or self-monitoring as a procedural aim, the objective is to instill in teachers a recognition of the value of disciplined inquiry and systematic reflection as a support to practice. A further aim is to provide practitioners with actual skills and techniques that they can use to reflect upon practice. Implications for teaching practice, in turn, emerge from teachers' reflections and self-examinations.

Implicit within the approaches incorporating this orientation that are described in the literature is a commitment to the reciprocity of though and action--the notion that "practice uninformed by thought, stultifies, while theory uninformed by practice is sterile" (Carini, 1978, p. 1). Teachers' reflections and deliberations are seen as valuable to those individuals immediately involved and to wider audiences of practitioners and researchers alike.

Knowledge Use

Scholars and practitioners have noted the uneven results of large- and small-scale efforts at school improvement and reform over the past two decades. During the latter 1950s and much of the 1960s, considerable optimism was voiced over the potential of new curricula, teaching machines, novel instructional methods, and other innovations. It was anticipated that widespread adoption of new methods and materials would lead to recognizable improvement in the quality of education and, by the mid 1960s, to amelioration of social problems as well. When the dramatic impacts that has been expected failed to materialize, much of the early optimism gave way to more cautious opinions, and even skepticism.

In describing the wave of reform that began in the 1950s, Miles (1964) observed that the focus of these change efforts was almost entirely on the content of the proposed change, with little or no attention to the nature of the change process. Miles and others began to suggest that more emphasis on the change process itself was needed in order to develop a better understanding of how innovations spread through the educational system and why some innovations appeared to be more successful than others. Early efforts in this direction consisted largely of indepth case studies conducted at a single site, documenting the success (or more often the apparent failure) of an innovation or plan for reform (see, for example, Gross, Giacquinta, & Bernstein, 1971; Smith & Keith, 1971).

As the case studies and other lines of research on change in schools continued, it became increasingly apparent that change is a complex process that unfolds over time along multiple dimensions. Variations in results cannot always be explained by programmatic differences. Innovations that appear very similar on paper often yield different results in different settings. Researchers and program developers began to suggest that lack of positive results is often associated with lack of change in the intended direction (non-implementation) or with inadequate attention to issues of long-term continuation of program improvements (failure to institutionalize).

Approaches that have been suggested for reducing the occurrence of implementation and institutionalization failures entail taking account of practitioners' perspectives in developing innovations and/or bringing practitioners themselves into more active roles in the innovation and dissemination processes. Efforts along these lines generally assume that most innovations developed outside the "real world" of the classroom or school system lack relevance to practitioners' needs and interests. More specifically, conventional approaches to innovation are criticized as offering practitioners no immediately apparent "relative advantage" (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971) over current activities, as lacking feasibility, or as unacceptable to teachers because they conflict with teachers' values and belief systems.

The most advanced development of these arguments is presented by Michael Fullen and Alan Pomfret in their excellent review of issues in curriculum innovations and the improvement of practice (1977). Fullan and Pomfret have classified studies of implementation into two categories: Fidelity ("the degree of implementation of an innovation in terms of the extent to which actual use of the innovation corresponds to intended or planned use", p. 340) and Process (analysis of "the complexities of the change process vis-à-vis how innovations become developed/changed, etc. during the process of implementation," Ibid.). These two approaches, although converging on the same target phenomenon, stem from quite separate research traditions. Whereas the fidelity approach emphasizes empirical replication of "core" innovation features (usually defined by the innovator) as suitable evidence of implementation, the process approach looks to patterns of organizational and personal change necessary to support or accommodate appropriate use as evidence of implementation (see, for example, Berman and McLaughlin, 1975). As Fullan and Pomfret argue, there are at least five dimensions of implementation in practice:

> (1) Changes in subject matter or materials (curriculum content)
> (2) Changes in organizational structure (formal arrangements and physical conditions--student grouping, staffing patterns, etc.)
> (3) Changes in role/behavior (teaching style or tasks; role relationships)
> (4) Changes in knowledge and understanding (about components of the innovation--its philosophy, assumptions, objectives, subject matter, role relationships, etc.)
> (5) Changes in value internalization (commitment to implementing various components of the innovation).
>
> (p. 336; 361-5)

An analysis of these five dimensions in terms of the fidelity and process traditions reveals an important overlap. Specifically, the fidelity perspective focuses on implementation primarily in terms of a

> ...role perspective. It starts with an innovation and derives from it a set of behaviors that users, typically teachers, must display at some future time before the innovation is considered to be implemented. The concern is with the extent to

> which actual behavioral changes correspond with planned behavioral change in individual roles. This approach assumes that the innovation consists of one behavior or a series of individual behaviors, and that only one role must change (or at least different roles will change separately). It follows, then, that the innovation is implemented when the occupants of the role display the appropriate behaviors.
>
> (p. 363)

These appropriate role behaviors, properly operationalized, can be measured as manifest most clearly in the "materials," "structures," and "behaviors" dimensions, but far less clearly in the "knowledge and understanding" and the "value internalization" dimensions.

The process perspective, on the other hand, keys into measurement (albeit indirect) of changes in role relationships, knowledge, understanding, and value internalization dimensions which, it is argued, would support or be concomitants of the intended degree of implementation. The process approach, however, is inadequate and inappropriate for detailed measurement of changes in specified materials usage, structures, and role behaviors.

Accordingly, these two major approaches to the specification and measurement of implementation are neither mutually exclusive nor redundant. Rather, they address partially overlapping subsets of Fullan and Pomfret's five dimensions of implementation. Moreover, by its very nature, the fidelity approach will be innovation specific, whereas the process approach should be somewhat independent of such specifics, since it addresses the emergence of new user characteristics which are consonant with appropriate use of the innovation, almost regardless of the actual innovation.

Gene Hall and his colleagues at the University of Texas at Austin's Center for Research and Development on Teacher Education have concentrated on methodologies which document the processes of practitioner involvement in the application of innovations. Their model--the Concerns-Based Adoption Model--keys on the change process from the practitioner's perspective in terms of progress with involvement and use of the innovation. This methodology clearly acknowledges the fundamental importance of beliefs, values, and expectations of practitioners in the use of any new practice or procedure. In other words, new approaches to educational practice, whether they emerge from innovative practitioners or from research and development efforts, ultimately require involvement of school-based practitioners for their use. Both Fullan and Hall have identified what appear to be key dimensions of this involvement and how progress along these dimensions can be quantified. Given these considerations, fairly compelling arguments for early and active involvement of school-based practitioners in the selection, adoption, and development of implementation procedures as a fundamental approach to staff and program development can be advanced. More importantly, failure to provide for such involvement may severely limit use of the innovation.

The concept of mutual adaptation, perhaps the most important single contribution from the Rand Corporation's massive investigation of the innovation and change process in schools (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975), posits that both the innovations and the practitioners undergo changes through the effective use of innovations. The National Diffusion Network study (Emrick et al., 1977) further suggests that the practitioners will adapt characteristics of their performance to characteristics of the innovation primarily in accord with their understanding of the innovation (its intended purpose, use, and changes over standard operating procedures that are implied by its essential features) and its consonance with their values, beliefs, and role expectations. Hall's methodology provides evidence that the adaptation process is relatively orderly and occurs in several stages. The first and most crucial stage seems to involve the user's assessment of the innovation: how its use will require changes in standard procedures and how it is consonant with professional values, beliefs, and role expectations.

When the magnitude of change or the discrepancy in roles/values represented by the innovation exceed some subjective limits, the innovation will be modified until it is within the compliance limits of the practitioner. If conditions of use do not permit such adaptation, the innovation simply will not be used, or at best will be used inappropriately or ineffectively. Under these conditions, even power-coercive tactics to direct and enforce "correct" use will largely fail, as many program developers, administrators, and change agents have discovered.

The implications of these considerations for practitioner involvement in staff development involving use of innovations are direct. Early and continuous participation of practitioners in the analysis and selection of innovations to be adopted and adapted to practice should serve several facilitative functions. First, involvement should act to surface conflicts and discrepancies which, as argued above, will accompany any innovation and can block its use. Identification and clarification of these conceptual and procedural obstacles is a necessary first step toward their possible resolution. Second, any change involves some re-education. To the extent practitioners have a nontrivial role in shaping this re-educative process, they will be more committed to its eventual success. This constitutes a positive and genuine approach to staff development for the improvement of practice. Third, successful experiences in active (rather than passive) involvement of practitioners in the use of innovations serves to build capacity for future change requirements. It can become the basis for the emergence of professional norms regarding practitioner roles and expectations in school change.

Governance and Decision Making

It was argued above that school practitioners have traditionally been on the receiving end of efforts to improve the quality of educational practice through inservice training and program development. Similarly, most important decisions regarding goals and priorities; staffing, administration, and discipline policies; curriculum; and instructional approaches have been made by school boards and administrators. Yet teachers bear major responsibility for carrying out these decisions on a day-to-day basis. In recent years a number of organizational theorists have suggested that conventional management structures are less than optimal for a variety of organizations and that participatory management structures will contribute to greater employee satisfaction, smoother organizational functioning, and increased productivity.

Lortie (1977) describes the formal and legal control structure of schools as "monolithic, hierarchical, and concentrated" (p. 337). Legal authority and responsibility for policy and school operations rest with the board of education; the board may choose to delegate certain powers to the superintendent and others. However, as Lortie and others point out, a number of factors operate to limit realization of the close control and supervision of activities implied by the formal structure. In contrast to the monolithic, hierarchical formal structure of governance, school systems have been described as operating, in fact, as loosely coupled organizations (Weick, 1976), functioning under a highly decentralized system of governance and subject to a complex array of influences--internal, local, state, and federal (Pincus, 1974). Schooling has been described as a labor-intensive process (Cresswell & Murphy, 1980), characterized by pluralism in goals and values and lack of a clear and universally practiced technology (Lortie, 1977; Pincus, 1974). It is generally agreed that most teachers enjoy a considerable degree of autonomy with regard to activities in their individual classrooms (see, e.g., Goodlad et al., 1974; Hornstein et al., 1971; Lortie, 1977).

At the same time, however, teachers' autonomy and influence have not traditionally extended beyond the classroom door. Teachers have not, for the most part, exerted a substantial degree of collective influence over decisions made at the school or district level (Liebermann, 1956). Ambrosie & Heller (1972), among others, point to tensions between the tradition of "paternalistic benevolence", in which decisions are made by school boards and administrators, and the emergence of movements toward professionalization among teachers.

It has been argued that attempts to elevate teaching to a fully professional status will require fundamental changes in some long-standing norms and role expectations for teachers. Cresswell & Murphy (1980) claim that teachers' traditional commitment to "selflessness" and "optimistic service to the children" (p. 223) has made it difficult for them to resist decisions made by others that offer improvements in instruction, even if the cost to teachers is high. They suggest that "the professional norms of self-determination and autonomous expertise may offer an alternative through which teachers can contribute to decisions aimed at improving instruction without demanding excessive personal costs from practitioners. Corwin (1974) suggests a fundamental dilemma: The individual autonomy traditionally enjoyed by teachers has been purchased at the expense of opportunities to exert a collective and significant influence on schooling. He argues that this personal autonomy is quite limited in scope and no longer sufficient to satisfy large numbers of teachers. Issues in collective bargaining and movements toward teacher militancy have involved attention to involvement in decisions about working conditions, new programs, etc., as well as "bread and butter" issues. Corwin suggests that if teachers as a group develop more cohesiveness (establish a colleague system comparable to that in other professions), their autonomy--in terms of independence from control by administrators and key persons outside the school—will be enhanced.

Theories of Job Satisfaction and Achievement Motivation

As stated earlier, a comprehensive and unified theoretical framework for school-based practitioner involvement has not yet been formulated. Rationales associated with knowledge development and application do not really serve as theoretic statements. Still, some recent theoretical developments in the psychologies of Personality, Motivation, and Achievement (Maslow, 1943, 1954; Herzberg, 1966; Argyris, 1964; Atkinson & Raynor, 1974; Gruneberg, 1979; McClelland, 1961) do appear relevant to issues of practitioner involvement and staff development. In other words, most of the theoretical formulations which relate to practitioner involvement presume some functional relationship between practitioner involvement and job satisfaction. In the remainder of this chapter, we will briefly characterize these theories and suggest some staff development implications.

Job satisfaction theories can be sorted into one of two categories: those which account for the conditions under which job satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) will occur—called content theories by Campbell, et al. (1970); and those which account for the dynamics of job satisfaction—called process theories (Campbell, et al. 1970). While the former--or content theories—are generally more widely known and researched, the process theories may appear to offer more in the way of implications for practical applications.

Content Theories. A familiar content theory of job satisfaction is based on the needs hierarchy postulated by Abraham Maslow (1943, 1954). Although Maslow did not explicitly address job satisfaction, his formulations have served as the springboard for the two-factor theory of job satisfaction made famous by Herzberg, and have heavily influenced the writings of organizational theorists such as Argyris (1960).

Briefly, Maslow postulates a five-level hierarchy of human needs which operate to direct human behavior. These needs are:

(1) Basic physiological (food, shelter);
(2) Safety and security (from danger, threat, deprivation);
(3) Social (affection, affiliation);
(4) Esteem (self-respect, peer approval, status); and
(5) Self-actualization (fulfillment through self-development).
(Maslow, 1954, pp. 35-46)

The first three needs are considered lower order, the last two higher order. Man is seen as "a perpetually wanting animal" (Lowry, 1974) controlled by that need which is not being fulfilled. Only after basic needs are satisfied will attention turn to higher-order needs. In the job situation, Maslow's theory would predict that only after lower-order needs for working conditions, security, and pay have been satisfied would the employee seek satisfaction and achievement from the work itself.

A formulation derived from Maslow's work which has stimulated a great deal of empirical research is known as the Herzberg two-factor theory of job satisfaction. This content theory translates Maslow's two orders of needs into factors which conditionally affect job satisfaction and dissatisfaction respectively. These two factors are labelled: (1) hygienes, or those conditions whose absence brings about dissatisfaction; and (2) motivators, or those conditions whose presence sets the occasion for satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966).

Examples of hygienes are pay, job security, employee benefits, and general working conditions. Examples of motivators are achievement incentives, status, challenge, autonomy, and aspects of the work which bring about intrinsic satisfaction and a sense of self-fulfillment. Both motivators and hygienes must be present in the job context for the employee to derive satisfaction from the job. However, the presence or absence of motivators will not affect dissatisfaction, as this is influenced only by hygienes.

Thus, Herzberg argues that factors such as vacation and pay schedules are hygienes which have little to do with deriving satisfaction from a job, but which certainly will produce dissatisfaction when they become deficient. The work itself, as well as conditions or attributes of the work (growth, achievement, sense of responsibility, recognition) lead to satisfaction, provided hygienes properly exist in the work environment (Herzberg, 1957, 1966).

Process Theories. This second group of theories attend to characteristics of the individual in relation to characteristics of the job and work environment. Process theories attempt to deal with (explain) the dynamics of job satisfaction, arguing that job satisfaction is determined by the needs, values, and expectations that people have in relation to their jobs, as well as by the characteristics of the job itself (its nature and context). A consideration of these theories and the evidence of their validity strengthens the case for school-based practitioner involvement as an appropriate tactic for staff development and school improvement.

A fairly direct process theory of job satisfaction is known as Equity theory (Dunnette, 1976). Equity theory postulates that job satisfaction will be determined by the individual's sense of equity regarding job tasks, conditions, and rewards relative to those of others in basically similar job contexts. The theory predicts the individual will adjust efforts and input in proportion to equity discrepancies s/he perceives in the current job situation. Underpaid employees will put out less effort or lower their standards of performance in proportion to the wage deficit. Similarly, overpaid employees would be expected to engage in instrumental activities to reduce the discrepancy—or certainly to express dissatisfaction.

Evidence does support the "underpaid" predictions. Such employees tend to be dissatisfied with their jobs, reduce the quality of their performance, and seek ways of increasing their net rewards. But "overpaid" employees, in contrast to theoretical expectations, seem quickly to reconcile themselves to the state of affirs, arguing that it is others who are being underpaid, that the system is at fault, or simply denying that a discrepancy exists (Pritchard, et al, 1972). Locke (1976), in fact, argues that the problem with Equity theory is not so much that it has been disproven, but that it is so loose as to account for any outcome.

A modest refinement of Equity theory is a formulation known as Reference Group theory (Hulin & Blood, 1968). This theory postulates that knowledge of the reference group to whom an individual relates is requisite to understanding job satisfaction. But as Korman (1977) and others (e.g., Locke, 1976; Amall, 1978; Amall & Gruneberg, 1976) point out, expectations based on reference groups must be supplemented by knowledge of an array of other components, such as personality traits, needs, values, and preferences of the individual. In this sense, the extent of detailed knowledge required of an individual before the theory can be applied may appear excessive or impractical. In our view, the theory is of value in a less direct sense. It underscores the importance of attending to the expectations of individuals in relation to their job or profession as a fundamental and necessary requisite to understanding job performance.

A fairly formal model of Need Fulfillment theory has been proposed by Vroom (1964). In this model, job satisfaction is seen as the sum of the extents to which individual needs are met (or fulfilled) by the job characteristics. Moreover, weightings are applied to further scale need discrepancies, since different needs are assumed to vary in importance within and across people. Thus, in this theory, one looks not only for values that conflict with or are fulfilled by the job conditions, but also the importance of the specific values.

Vroom (1964) cites evidence showing that shared decision making (participative management) leads to improved job satisfaction only to the extent decision inolvement is positively valued by the teachers.
This means that individuals will be distributed (the form of the distribution is unknown) independently on separate values or needs. Assume the distribution is multivariate-normal with respect to $\underline{n}$ needs, with

each need occupying an importance or subjective weight (W_i). The introduction of any modification in job conditions can be expected to influence job satisfaction as the weighted sum of value/need discrepancies associated with the condition. Thus:

$$S_p = \sum_{i=1}^{n} W_i \Delta n_i$$

where
S_p = Person$_{(p)}$
W_i = Importance of need$_{(i)}$
Δn_i = Change in need state $n_{(i)}$

represents the expected satisfaction index for person p regarding the job conditions under consideration.

Critics (e.g., Locke, 1976) of this model argue that it overlooks a major quantitative variable—namely, how much of something is wanted. For example, wanting a lot of money is not the same as wanting money a lot, in Locke's opinion. Perhaps a more challenging concern pertains to quantification of values, weights, and discrepancies. The utility of this theory, it would appear, is in its ability to provide fairly precise and detailed predictions of the appropriateness and acceptability of changes in job context or conditions. Unlike Herzberg's model, it assumes that the satisfying or motivating attributes of a job are contained not in the tasks, but in how the tasks relate to the values, needs, and expectations of the individual who is to carry them out. This provides the job planner with a powerful capability to assess in advance the likely impact of a given change in job conditions on staff acceptance and satisfaction. Stated differently, the theory implies that the likelihood a given intervention will produce a specific result can be reasonably well estimated prior to and independent of the implementation of the intervention under consideration. The interventionist would have to gather information on extant values of the employees and skillfully analyze how these values would be impacted by the planned intervention. By modifying relevant aspects of the intervention, presumably unwanted outcomes (ranging, say, from reduced net job satisfaction to work slowdowns, strikes, or resignations) can be avoided.

This Need Fulfillment theory (or Value Discrepancy model) seems to have a great deal of relevance to staff development objectives, and appears fairly utilitarian in a prescriptive sense. Two further relevant theories which focus more on productivity than on job satisfaction are Atkinson's theory of Achievement Motivation (Atkinson & Feather, 1966; Atkinson & Raynor, 1974) and McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y (McGregor, 1960).

In his theory of Achievement Motivation, Atkinson postulates that an individual's tendency to approach and engage in an achievement-oriented activity can be represented as the mathematical sum of three components:

- M_s, or a tendency of the individual to engage in a task which offers an opportunity for success, conditioned by: (1) P_s, or the subjective probability that success will be the outcome (i.e., that the individual will succeed), and (2) I_s, or the importance of success on this task. Thus, this component is represented as $T_s = M_s(P_s)(I_s)$.
- M_{af}, or a tendency to avoid failure or avoid situations where failure is likely, conditioned by: (1) P_f, or the subjective probability that a given task will lead to failure, and (2) I_f, or the importance of the task (subjective) to the individual. This is represented in Atkinson's theory as $T_{af} = M_{af}(P_f)(I_f)$.
- Text, or extrinsic influences which produce tendencies to perform, but which are not part of achievement motivation per se. This component of the theory acknowledges the influence that social contexts may exert on the performance situation.

In words, the theory predicts that achievement-oriented activity will be the sum of the individual's attraction to success opportunities (weighted by the likelihood of success and the importance of success offered by the situation at hand) plus the individual's avoidance of failure situations (also weighted by the value and likelihood of failure perceived in the situations) plus a social conformity number.

Atkinson's theory appears as an extension and elaboration of the Expectancy and Need Fulfillment theories described above (although much of Atkinson's work clearly predates Job Satisfaction theory). Atkinson's model differs, however, in several important respects. First, the incentive values of success (I_s) and failure (I_f) are inverse linear functions of the subjective estimates of success and failure, respectively, rather than independent additive components as in Need Fulfillment theory. Second, the theory is meant to predict behavior only in "achievement situations", i.e., "situations in which a person not only sees himself or herself as responsible for a somewhat uncertain outcome, but knows that the outcome for which s/he is responsible will be evaluated against a standard of excellence (Sjogren & Maehr, 1971, p. 144). In other words, achievement situations are those which require skill and competence. Third, a great deal of empirical evidence has been generated around tests, refinements, and extensions of the theory (see, e.g., Atkinson & Raynor, 1978).

Most of the applications of Atkinson's theory have been in the industrial workplace, and primarily in redesigning jobs to more closely match the nature of tasks with the characteristics of the worker subgroups who are to carry them out. In some cases this has led to job expansion, in others to job reduction. Maehr & Sjogren (1971) suggest a number of educational implications in such areas as ability grouping and programmed instruction. More interestingly, they comment, "the techniques generally used to attract and hold teachers, e.g., tenure, salary schedules, pay, vacations, fringe benefits, certification, etc., are techniques most likely to appeal to the person with low achievement motivation...Might it be that the supposedly static condition of education is a direct result of personnel practices which tend to discourage the recruitment and retention of the risk taker and innovator?" (p. 157).

Although it is most unlikely that education personnel policies intentionally screen achievement-oriented candidates from the profession, Maehr and Sjogren's point deserves consideration. What, one might ask, exists in the educational work environment to stimulate or reinforce achievement-oriented behavior? What opportunities do teachers have to see themselves as responsible for outcomes which are to be judged against standards of excellence?

The final "theory" to be considered in this section addresses the above questions, and has served as the conceptual basis for at least one of the successful applications of practitioner involvement described in Chapter 5. This two-part formulation has been referred to as McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X is based on a set of assumptions regarding the work motives in the average worker. To paraphrase the theory, it is assumed that the average person:

(1) Has an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if possible.

(2) Prefers to be directed and supervised.

(3) Primarily seeks security.

(4) Has relatively little ambition.

(5) Wishes to avoid responsibility.

Because of these negative work-related values, it follows from the theory that the average worker will need to be coerced, controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment in order to motivate him or her to put forth adequate effort toward achieving organizational objectives. This is the rationale for the dominant mode of management and administration characteristic of American school systems.

Theory Y, on the other hand, makes quite different assumptions regarding work motives and personality dynamics of the average person. Specifically, in Theory Y it is assumed:

(1) That the average person does not dislike work. Rather, the expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or leisure.

(2) External control and threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about efforts toward organizational objectives. The average person can and will exercise self-direction in the service of objectives to which s/he is committed.

(3) Commitment to objectives is a function of the extrinsic and intrinsic rewards associated with achievement.

(4) The average person learns, under proper condtions, not only to accept but also to seek responsibility.

(5) The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of creativity, imagination, and ingenuity in the solution of task-related problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the general population.

(6) In most contemporary work environments, the intellectual potential of the worker is only partially realized.

(Mescon & Rachman, 1976)

It is immediately apparent that Theory Y is supportive and consonant with arguments for practitioner involvement as a means to staff development and job satisfaction. Moreover, research in the field of job satisfaction has focused on establishing that conditions which lead to improved job satisfaction lead also to increased:

- productivity,
- problem-solving effectiveness,
- worker commitment,
- loyalty and stability, and
- improved workplace conditions.

These "outcomes" certainly correspond well to objectives of most educational staff development programs. Unfortunately, job satisfaction research has been inconclusive so that arguments for practitioner involvement must be advanced more on theoretical or philosophical considerations than on a strong body of empirical evidence.

In the remainder of this report, we will describe the results of our investigation into efforts to promote more active participation and involvement of school practitioners in three major staff development applications:

- participation in the research and knowledge production process,
- active involvement in the application of innovations to the improvement of practice, and
- more active involvement in school-based instructional decision making and governance.

Chapter 3

PRACTITIONER INVOLVEMENT IN KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION

In Chapter 1 we introduced the concept of school-based practitioner involvement for staff development and the improvement of practice. In Chapter 2 we reviewed arguments that have been advanced to support more active participation of practitioners in knowledge production, utilization, and governance. In Chapters 3, 4, and 5 we will describe a number of efforts that have been undertaken with the explicit intent of bringing school-based practitioners into more active roles in these three areas. In carrying out this review, we searched the literature for examples of practitioner involvement applications in such areas as research, program improvement, and decision making. In addition to reviewing the literature, we selected five efforts representing a fairly broad spectrum of practitioner involvement applications for more indepth case study investigation. The case studies included site visits to interview teachers and other stakeholders as well as review of available reports and other documentation.

Two case studies focusing on practitioner involvement in the production of knowledge are reported in this chapter: the San Diego implementation of the Interactive Research and Development on Teaching Project initiated at the Far West Laboratory,and the collection of processes for involving practitioners in systematic observation, documentation, and reflection on practice developed at the Prospect School and Center for Education and Research. Three case studies of practitioner involvement in governance and decision making will be reported in Chapter 5, below. Original case studies of applications focusing on knowledge utilization were not conducted for this investigation. Instead, in Chapter 4 we draw from our own previous work (Emrick et al., 1977; Emrick & Peterson, 1978a) as well as the work of others who have studied the dissemination of knowledge and practice improvements and the process of improvement-oriented change within school settings.

Chapter 3 is organized into two sections corresponding to two relatively distinct general orientations to practitioner involvement in knowledge production. In the first section we review several efforts to involve teachers and other school-based personnel in conducting educational research studies. Included within this section are a brief review of the action research movement, the IR&DT case study, a description of the teacher collaborator program currently underway at Michigan State's Institute for Research on Teaching, and an effort undertaken in Scotland to involve teachers in analysis and interpretation of data in a computerized data bank. In the second section we examine two approaches focused on developing within teachers the interest and the skills for self-monotoring and disciplined inquiry into the nature and impacts of their own practice: John Elliott's triangulation model and the Prospect case study.

Knowledge Production through Practitioner Involvement in Research

The Action Research Movement

An early approach to bringing practitioners into active participation in the generation of knowledge was termed action research. Corey (1948) drew distinctions between action research and traditional or fundamental research in terms of goals, assumptions, researcher and practitioner roles, and criteria for weighing the contribution of findings. Briefly, fundamental research is carried out to develop new generalizations and test hypotheses in such a way that conclusions can be extended beyond the specific situations studied. The action research alternative calls for studies done by practitioners within their own settings, because "a teacher is most likely to change his ways of working with pupils because of information he himself accumulates about these same pupils in order to work more effectively with them" (Corey, 1948, p. 511, emphasis added). Active involvement of teachers throughout the research process was a central thrust of action research, although Wrightstone (1949) and Chein et al. (1948) suggested that professional researchers could play important roles in helping develop study plans, instruments, and other technical areas.

Although action research approaches enjoyed some popularity during the 1940's and 1950's,* Corey (1948) pointed to the paucity of "how-to" information as a major problem. Little concrete guidance was available for potential action researchers. Further, although improved practice was the aim, no commonly accepted standards existed for judging the quality of methods, the validity of findings, or the actual impacts on practice. As such, it proved difficult for persons not involved in a specific effort to judge its merit, and activities tended to remain isolated rather than feeding into an accumulating knowledge base.

The action research movement in education subsided to a considerable extent after the 1950's (Clegg, Anglin, & Patton, 1978). This was about the same time that federal investment in educational research emerged as a significant source of support for universities and institutions created specifically to carry out educational research and development. In the mid 1970s interest in bringing practitioners into active roles in the generation of knowledge through classroom-based research emerged again in such efforts as the Far West Laboratory's Interactive Research and Development on Teaching Project.

---

*See Mort (1945), Wrightstone (1949), and Wann (1952) for examples of action research efforts.

Interactive Research and Development on Teaching Project (IR&DT)

One of the more serious and carefully studied attempts to design and implement a strategy for involving school-based practitioners in collaborative research that is reported in the literature is the Interactive Research and Development on Teaching Project (Tikunoff, Ward, & Griffin, 1979). In this project, two local teams of teachers, research/evaluation personnel, and staff development specialists were formed to investigate issues of their own selection and to develop inservice programs to spread their methodologies and findings to local colleagues. The IR&DT strategy was originally proposed by Betty Ward and Bill Tikunoff of the Far West Laboratory as an alternative to the linear view of improvement-oriented change in education as a four-stage process of research, development, diffusion, and adoption, with practitioners involved only in the final stage. Ward & Tikunoff (1976) criticized the linear model for generally failing to bring the results of research to bear on programs of teacher education or classroom practice. In place of the linear model, they proposed an approach calling for research and development activities to be conducted concurrently by teams of practitioners, researchers, and trainers/teacher educators on issues and questions identified by classroom teachers.

A field trial of the IR&DT strategy was undertaken over a 15-month period from August 1977 to November 1978, with support from the Teaching and Learning Division of the National Institute of Education. IR&DT teams were formed at two locations--an urban site in California (San Diego) and a rural site in Vermont. These two settings were purposely selected to provide diverse conditions. The field trial also included a detailed investigation of the implementation of the IR&DT approach. The study examined the feasibility and advisability of the approach both as an alternative model for conducting educational research and development and as an intervention intended to provide professional development opportunities for the participants.

Activities supported by IR&DT progressed through a series of stages—recruitment of team members, orientation, selection of a question for study, development of the study design, data collection, analysis and reporting, dissemination of methods and findings. With the exception of recruitment and orientation, major responsibility for the various activities was assumed by the local teams. Researchers from Far West conducted the recruitment and orientation and provided technical assistance upon request. The Far West researchers convened an advisory panel to provide feedback to the local teams regarding their study design and draft reports. Six juries, with members representing research, teacher education, and practice perspectives, were assembled to judge the local teams' study products according to two criteria: technical rigor (soundness of the design, data collection procedures, analysis techniques, etc.) and usefulness to practitioner audiences. In carrying out the current investigation of staff development issues in practitioner involvement, a follow-up case study of the San Diego IR&DT site was conducted. This study is reported below.

Context. The San Diego Unified School District serves the ninth largest municipality in the nation. With a student population of approximately 120,000 (as of 1977-78) distributed over a 195 square mile area, the district includes 122 elementary and 39 secondary schools. The IR&DT project operated in two elementary schools: the first, a small school (400 pupils) serving predominantly black (75%) and hispanic (20%) pupil populations and heavily impacted by federal and state categorical aid programs; the other, a much larger school (1200 pupils) located in a middle-income suburban area where the population was predominantly white (77%).

Recruitment of Team Members. Selection of two schools as sites from which to draw practitioner participants for the local team was accomplished by working through administrative channels. The Far West originators of the IR&DT strategy met first with the district's inservice education director and one of the elementary education area directors. Staff at the school in the low-income area had previously expressed interest in collaborating with the Far West staff on a similar effort; the other school was suggested to provide for diversity in pupil populations and school organizational features. Principals at the two schools were contacted next; they agreed to allow Far West staff to recruit volunteers from among their faculties.

Presentations were made to the faculties at each school to explain the IR&DT strategy and the role that teacher participants would play. At the low-income school, three teachers who expressed interest were selected. At the larger school, two teachers expressed interest; one was selected. (The four teachers selected all taught in primary grade classrooms; the other teacher taught fifth grade.) The teachers represented a range in experience. One was new to teaching; another had seven years of experience and was considering enrolling in a master's program; the third had recently completed her master's (in educational administration) and was interested in moving to an administrative position on the district staff; the fourth had almost ten years of classroom experience and a master's in early childhood education.

The researcher and teacher educator members of the team were nominated by the district's inservice education director. These roles were originally envisioned as filled by university personnel, such that IR&DT would represent a strategy involving inter-institutional collaboration. This staffing configuration was used at the rural IR&DT site. However, at the San Diego site, the district maintained both an evaluation office and a staff development office, so it was decided to staff the local team entirely from within the school system.

Orientation/Initial Training. Participants were recruited in Spring 1977. The first major activity was a three-day orientation and training session in August. The purposes of this session were to:

(1) introduce the team members to various research paradigms,

(2) inform the team members of their roles regarding IR&DT implementation,

(3) explain the data collection procedures to be used to study the manner in which each team went about IR&DT implementation, and

(4) explain the fiscal, inter-institutional, and other procedures for communication related to administration of the project.

(Tikunoff, Ward, & Griffin, 1979, p. 125)

Open-ended feedback questionnaires completed after the initial session indicated that participants generally understood and endorsed the concepts underlying IR&DT and the roles that they were expected to play in the effort. During interviews conducted more than two years later for the current case study, teacher participants recalled that they had found the technical presentations at the session (e.g., development of a research design, use of ethnographic methodology) overwhelming and somewhat premature. Completion of the first task on the agenda presented to them--i.e., selection of the research question (a task in which teachers were told they would have the major say)--was apparently of more immediate relevance to the teachers than activities that would occur somewhere down the line. The teachers also recalled the off-campus setting for the session as providing an atmosphere conducive to productive interactions and development of an early sense of teamwork.

Selection of the Research Topic. The research question selected by the San Diego team was the following:

> What are the strategies and techniques which classroom teachers use to cope with distractions to classroom instruction and how effective are the techniques?

The topic grew out of early suggestions from teacher participants that the team focus on an issue related to discipline and to the district's expressed interest in maximizing pupils' time-on-task. All team members found the topic acceptable. However, a major area of interest to the team--the opening weeks of school--was effectively eliminated from consideration because of the schedule. Both the local team and the Far West staff have recommended that orientation, issue selection, and design activities be accomplished during late spring and summer in future efforts of this type, so that teacher participants will have time to explore the literature for alternative issues and the full school year will be available for data collection (Tikunoff, Ward, & Lazar, 1980).

Development of the Research Design. The research design was prepared during Fall 1977. According to teachers interviewed, the researcher/evaluator "guided" activities during this phase of the effort; he and the staff development specialist were acknowledged by teacher participants as having greater familiarity and expertise regarding technical issues. Teachers were involved in decisions about data collection approaches and development of categorization schemes for recording distractions in the classroom, teachers' coping behaviors, and the effectiveness of these behaviors toward resumption of instruction.

Teachers' participation at this stage involved attendance at team meetings and visits to other classrooms to observe the types of distractions occurring and the coping techniques used by teachers. Both teachers and principals expressed a desire to keep teachers' time out of class to a minimum. Hence, team meetings during this and subsequent phases of the project were held after school, on the weekend, and during school vacations.*

Data Gathering. Data collection was carried out in the classrooms of the four teachers on the team and four additional teachers recruited by the team. The additional teachers were selected to match the original team members in terms of grade level and pupil populations. According to team teachers interviewed, recruiting the additional teachers was not particularly difficult. It was hoped that these teachers would supplement the original team, participating actively in data analysis and report preparation activities. However, sustaining their involvement beyond data collection proved to be difficult; it appears that they did not become fully integrated into the original team.

Three data-gathering approaches were employed: (1) observations using checklists on which types, frequencies, and duration of distractions and coping behaviors were recorded; (2) narrative accounts generated simultaneously by an ethnographic observer; and (3) journals in which the classroom teachers recorded their perception of the classroom environment, activities, distractions, and coping techniques on the days when they were observed. Seven of the observers were experienced classroom teachers on leave of absence trained to use the checklists; the eighth observer had experience using ethnographic approaches.

---

*Teachers were compensated for time spent on project work outside normal work hours.

Data collection included three cycles of observation. After the second cycle, all eight teachers met with the researcher/evaluator and staff development specialist to develop preliminary results and discuss coping strategies that appeared to be most effective. Team members described this activity as an "intervention;" one of their interests in the final observations was to see whether new coping techniques were being used and, if so, whether the new techniques were effective. However, they also stressed that their orientation was not evaluative in the sense of judging each other's effectiveness or dictating coping strategies to be followed on the basis of their observation data. The intervention consisted of group discussions among a collection of experienced practitioners, the inservice specialist, and the evaluator, each of whom could draw on his/her own experience as well as data collected for the specific purpose of looking for patterns in distractions and coping techniques.

Data Analysis and Report Preparation. Analysis of data from the third cycle proved somewhat difficult. After the group discussion of coping techniques, several of the teachers began to experiment with nonverbal coping techniques (e.g., a prearranged signal to a child who was creating a disruption). However, the observers often did not recognize that a teacher touching her nose while looking at a particular child was using an intentional coping device. As such, the checklist data showed less use of coping techniques than expected. The teachers found evidence of the use and effectiveness of the nonverbal techniques in their journals and the ethnographic accounts. This they viewed as demonstrating the importance of using multiple approaches to data collection as well as confirming the value of their own involvement in the analysis phase of the research.

Teachers involved with preparation of project reports described the writing stage as one of the more difficult aspects of their involvement.

As classroom teachers they had almost no training or experience in the conventions of reporting research results. Teachers suggested that future efforts of this type be scheduled so that writing activities would be done during the summer and recommended that some training and assistance in technical report writing be provided to teacher participants.

Dissemination: Local Training and External Reporting. A distinctive feature of the IR&DT approach was the explicit connection it called for between research and staff development. One product of the local team's effort was an inservice program designed to give larger numbers of teachers direct experience in carrying out similar research. The program was developed by the local team and taught by the staff development specialist (with some involvement of practitioner team members. The inservice program was not intended simply to pass on the findings from the IR&DT team's work; nor was it intended to take additional teachers through the entire process of selecting a topic to study, creating a research design, and so on. Rather, the aim was to familiarize teachers with both the methodology and the findings from the original study and to provide them with opportunities to collect additional data on distractions and coping behaviors in their own classrooms.

According to the inservice specialist, the program has been offered four times and has been well subscribed. He attributed the popularity of the course in part to its focus on classroom management issues. (The vast majority of inservice offerings in the district deal with curriculum.) The course has also attracted interest within the central office because of its relevance to the district's emphasis on increasing pupils' time on task.

One of the more difficult aspects of the program—the observation component--may also be one of its most valuable. According to the inservice specialist, the prospect of being observed is still a source of discomfort and apprehension for some teachers. However, the original IR&DT team teachers insisted that the inservice program include observations. To reduce anxiety about observation, teachers in the program are paired so that each observes in the other's classroom. Although some difficulties have arisen in securing released time for teachers to carry out the observations, many regard the opportunity to observe another classroom as valuable, particularly in demonstrating that similar distractions arise in other classes and that alternative coping strategies may be worth trying. The experience of being observed can be valuable too, since it provides the teacher with new information on events in his or her classroom and access to the perspective of a colleague who has visited the classroom during instruction. Even some teachers who expressed early concern about being observed came to value the opportunity for collegial interchange and suggested that teachers should be given more occasions to observe in each others' classes. The inservice specialist reported that data from the additional observations in primary grade classrooms tend to replicate the distraction patterns (frequency, source) from the original study; data from upper elementary and secondary classrooms have revealed new patterns, extending the findings from the earlier work.

With regard to dissemination beyond the district, efforts have been limited. IR&DT team members, including practitioners, have participated in national conferences and presented their work at meetings of professional research associations. Involvement in these dissemination activities has generally been initiated by Far West Laboratory, and presentations have dealt mainly with the interactive and collaborative nature of the IR&DT strategy rather than with the details of the local team's research methods and findings concerning classroom distractions.

Discussion. The experience of the San Diego IR&DT team provides evidence to support the feasibility of externally initiated efforts to provide school practitioners with training and actual experience in conducting research in classroom settings. Juries of researchers, teachers, and teacher educators assembled by the originators of the IR&DT strategy judged the San Diego team's work to be somewhat more rigorous than the average educational research project, very useful to teachers, and much more useful for staff development purposes than typical research. However, the same juries arrived at a different set of judgments concerning the products generated by the other IR&DT team.*

---

* The second IR&DT team, located in rural Vermont, investigated the question: Are there relationships between the mood of the teacher and the teacher's classroom supportive instructional behavior? If so, what is the nature of these relationships?

The second team's efforts were rated as less rigorous than typical research, not at all useful for classroom instruction, and about as useful as typical R&D for staff development purposes. Judged as an alternative approach to carrying out research, then, the IR&DT strategy produced mixed results. Given that only two sites were included in the test of the IR&DT strategy, the reasons for the substantial differences in the technical soundness and practical utility of the two teams' efforts (as judged by the juries) are difficult to determine; the Far West researchers speculated that differences in team leadership, continuity of personnel, and teacher participants' previous experience with innovations were important factors.

The Far West researchers also examined IR&DT as an intervention intended to produce staff development benefits to the local participants and the institutions in which they worked. They concluded that IR&DT was relatively successful as an intervention in both settings in terms of increasing participants' understanding of the complexities of the classroom environment; providing them with new skills for carrying out research and interpreting research studies done by others; reducing isolation and building collegial relationships among practitioners as well as between practitioners and research/teacher education specialists; enhancing participants' sense of professionalism; and increasing their awareness of, and willingness to consult, new resources for information and ideas. The Far West researchers concluded that the approach represented an important vehicle for professional growth among the participants, with a significant potential for encouraging practitioners to become careful observers of their practice and to assume responsibility for improving their practice.

Among the teachers on the team, some differences in participation level and apparent impact were identified during the interviews conducted for this case study. The two younger teachers were more heavily involved in the final stages of the effort (analysis, reporting, and training) than were the other two teachers. Various team members agreed that the younger teachers found their participation a stimulating experience that presented new challenges and opened up new possibilities for their roles as education professionals. Both enrolled in masters programs during or after their involvement in IR&DT. One has become a resource teacher at a magnet school in the district, where she is involved in the planning and implementation of an observational study investigating pupils' academic learning time. She attributed her assignment to this post, and her ability to assume a leadership role in the new study, in large measure to her experience in IR&DT. She also reported maintaining some contact with the researcher/evaluator and staff development specialist team members, whom she regards as sources of advice on technical matters and inservice techniques.

Of the two teachers less involved in the reporting activities, one has retained her assignment as a classroom teacher. The other has become a resource teacher in the district's human relations program, providing training to district and school staff and in-class programs for students. This teacher described her IR&DT experience as related only marginally to her current assignment--largely in terms of increasing her skills related to reading and assessing research reports. She emphasized the professional development benefits for the two younger teachers--the maturity they had demonstrated and the new skills, enhanced self-esteem, and leadership abilities--as the primary benefit from the program.

Teacher Collaborator Program

An alternative means for directly involving small numbers of school-based practitioners in the conduct of educational research studies has been developed at Michigan State University's Institute for Research on Teaching. Through the Teacher Collaborator program, individual practitioners have been released from their teaching assignments on a half-time basis to work with Institute staff on ongoing research studies for periods of a year or longer (Bawden, Florio, & Wanous, 1980). While serving as a teacher collaborator, with half of his or her salary paid by the Institute, the practitioner remains in the classroom half time.

The teacher collaborator program has not been studied as an approach to generating valid and useful research to the same extent as the IR&DT approach. Institute researchers have described the teacher collaborators as valuable informants, whose knowledge of classroom events adds an important perspective to development and implementation of data collection procedures and to data analysis and interpretation of findings. For the researcher, the primary benefits of the approach are increases in the validity of the specific research carried out with assistance from teacher collaborators and in the understanding of the classroom setting and the practice of education that researchers develop through close and continuing contact with practicing teachers.

A teacher collaborator has described his experience in the program as an opportunity for personal and professional growth that is not available in staff development programs typically offered to teachers. The vast majority of inservice offerings are focused on improving pupils' motivation and achievement through training teachers to use new curricula, teaching methods, or activities. Inservice is viewed as a means for bringing practice more closely in line with standards and objectives determined by persons other than the practitioners themselves. Taking time away from classroom instruction for professional development or other activities is actively discouraged; hence staff development tends to consist of short-term, fragmented efforts conducted at the end of the school day. As a result, inservice becomes viewed more or less as a necessary evil by teachers, administrators, and staff developers alike. Differences in individual practitioners' values, beliefs, and behaviors are often treated essentially as impediments to improvement. Opportunities for professional interactions and interchange with colleagues or persons from other sectors of the educational community are few. These conditions of isolation and lack of stimulation are regarded by the teacher collaborator as a major contributing factor to the growing phenomenon of burnout among classroom teachers.

In contrast to the view of staff development as a corrective and standardizing activity held within the public schools, the teacher collaborator describes his exposure through the program to a very different orientation to professional development held in the research community. In particular, the research community

> ...encourages professional development of a more personal nature by valuing activities other than those valued by the public schools. The ability to articulate philosophies of education, even conflicting philosophies, is looked upon favorably. The ability to question and discover is of extreme importance to one's functioning in the research community. Keeping abreast of current research in professional journals is a necessary survival skill encouraged and promoted in research. The ability

> to write and be published is seen as a requirement rather than a nice frill. The research community values the exchange of ideas and the ability to disseminate methods, findings, and implications at a national level.
>
> (Bawden, Florio, & Wanous, 1980, p. 20)

In short, professional development is regarded as a lifelong process of growth that is goverened by the individual professional and highly valued by the community.

The teacher collaborator describes the program as a stimulating opportunity to "live in two worlds" and to study teaching "from the outside." What is not yet clear is the extent to which individual practitioners participating in activities of this type will be able to affect some reconciliation for themselves between the disparate values held by the research and public school communities, or how the small number of teachers who may become involved in such efforts can bring about any recognizable impacts on the systems in which they work.

Scottish Education Data Archive

The generation of knowledge through educational research is also described by Cope & Gray (1979). Their effort was designed to acquaint teachers and administrators with the Scottish Education Data Archive, a data base containing information obtained through a national survey of students and persons recently out of school concerning their school experiences. Distinguishing their approach from efforts in the "teacher as researcher" movement that focus on training teachers to carry out original research in their classrooms, Cope & Gray argue that information in extant data bases is of potential value to practitioners. Its relevance to them can be established by involving them in data analysis and interpretation; they need not be involved in collecting new data. Cope & Gray outline an additional aim of their approach as providing practitioners equal access to the information resources currently used by educational policy makers. Practitioners, they reason, will be able to enter into deliberations about the content and conduct of education only when they have access to the information resources used by others.

The approach taken by Cope & Gray involved a series of workshops and tutorials in various locations across Scotland. These activities had two objectives: (1) convincing practitioners that the data bank contained information potentially relevant to addressing their own questions and concerns; and (2) development within practitioners of the skills in question framing and data inquiry needed to make use of the data base. The problem areas reported by Cope & Gray largely involved overcoming teachers' skepticism about the relevance of research data to their own concerns and, in particular, their suspicion about the validity of self-report data collected from students (Elliott, 1977, reported a similar problem in his account of efforts to implement triangulation). Special problems emerged when research data came into apparent conflict with the practitioners' beliefs and value systems or with the conventional wisdom.

According to Cope & Gray, practitioners came to constitute one of the most active and growing groups of users of the data bank. At the same time, they also point out that the proportion of the national teacher population who became aware of the data bank was "tiny", and the proportion who actually used the data bank to examine questions of interest to them was even smaller. Like the IR&DT researchers, Cope & Gray describe their efforts to date to involve school practitioners in knowledge production mainly as a demonstration of the feasibility of their approach.

Knowledge Production through Practitioner Reflection and Self-Assessment

Some researchers and others have questioned the appropriateness of approaches to the professional development of practicing teachers that focus exclusively on training them to use the traditional methods of educational research. These arguments were reviewed in Chapter 2, above; for the most part they call into question the assumption that practitioners can or will employ the methods of scientific research to address the problems and concerns that they face in the classroom on a daily basis. MacDonald (1974), Elliott (1975), Bussis (1980), and others have suggested that alternative approaches that acknowledge the legitimacy of the practitioner's perspective and seek to enrich, rather than change, this perspective by bringing the practitioner into direct and regular contact with the views of colleagues and/or other groups in the educational community are needed. They reason that such approaches, which do not ask the practitioner to "live in two worlds" but rather to consider alternative interpretations of past events and courses of future actions, are better suited to the complexities of the classroom environment and the teacher's need to respond immediately to situations that cannot be fully anticipated.

In the remainder of this chapter, two such approaches are described. The first is the triangulation model developed by John Elliott and his colleagues as a means of helping teachers to reflect critically on their own practice and ultimately to build practical theories of teaching on the basis of practitioners' implicit theories and practical deliberations. The second is the collection of processes for observation, documentation, and reflection on practice in the classroom developed by Patricia Carini and her colleagues at the Prospect Archive and Center for Education and Research.

The Triangulation Model

John Elliott's triangulation model was developed within the context of the Ford Teaching Project's attempt to involve school practitioners in research on the problems of implementing inquiry/discovery approaches in classrooms (Elliott, 1977). The original research agenda called for an action research program of collaborative examination of implementation problems, development and testing of possible solutions, and clarification of the values and aims implicit in inquiry/discovery approaches. It was assumed that practitioners' involvement in the research would lead to professional development among the participants by enabling them to reflect critically on their own behaviors and the theories implicit within these behaviors and to consider alternatives that might be more compatible with the objectives of the instructional approaches they were attempting to implement. The aim was to generate explicit practical theories which the teachers could use to examine their own practice. It was also expected that the collaborative involvement of researchers and teachers would lead to production of knowledge that would be applicable beyond the immediate settings in which the research was carried out. That is, it was assumed that certain patterns in teachers' behaviors and implicit theories represented frequently encountered obstacles to successful implementation of inquiry/discovery approaches and that increased understanding of these patterns would facilitate future implementation efforts.

Elliott and his colleagues encountered a number of difficulties in their early contacts with the teachers (gaining access, building interest in participation, developing a shared language, etc.). Teachers indicated that they did not have the time to carry out the documentation and other tasks as planned. Further, many saw little need for the research activities because they felt they were encountering few, if any, problems in their classrooms. Elliott's team recognized that some modifications to the original design were in order:

> We faced a situation where two-thirds of the teachers who had joined the project appeared to have little interest in doing action research or opportunities within their schools to cultivate such interests. We, therefore, had to draw a firm distinction between those teachers who are ready to reflect more deeply about their practice because they at least sense gaps between it and their aspirations, and those who are not ready because they have no sense of any such gap existing...it became clear that our problem was how to motivate the majority of teachers to adopt a reflective stance, since the action-research approach presupposes readiness to reflect. And even those dozen or so teachers who were properly motivated found pressures of time and work load overriding their commitment to the enterprise.
>
> (Elliott, 1977, p. 5, emphasis added)

The triangulation approach taken by the researchers in response to this situation was attempted both as a tool or device to facilitate reflection among the minority of teachers who appeared "ready" to adopt a reflective stance toward their practice and as a motivating device for the larger group of teachers who did not appear ready to engage in self-monitoring activities. Triangulation techniques were initially used only in the classrooms of teachers believed ready for self-monitoring, in the hope that data would be shared with other teachers and that exposure to the benefits of the approach would motivate some of these others to engage in reflection and self-examination themselves. Elliott describes the triangulation technique as follows:

> Triangulation involves gathering accounts of a teaching situation from three quite different points of view: those of the teacher, the students, and a participant observer...Each point of the triangle stands in a unique epistemological position with respect to access to relevant data about a teaching situation. The person in the best position to gain access via introspection to the intentions and aims in the situation is the teacher. The students are in the best position to explain how the teacher's actions influence the way they respond in the situation. The participant observer is in the best position to collect data about the observable features of the interaction between teacher and students. By comparing an account with the accounts from the two other standpoints, a person at one point of the triangle has an opportunity to test and perhaps revise it on the basis of more sufficient data.
>
> (*Ibid*., p. 10)

Implementation of the technique involved observation and tape-recording of classroom instruction by a member of the research team, followed by tape-recorded interviews of the classroom teacher and the students. The researchers encountered some early apprehension among teachers and students alike. To reduce teachers' anxiety about collection of students' perceptions and judgments, the teacher was interviewed first, and students were interviewed only with the teacher's permission. To reduce student concerns and increase candor, researchers conducted the student interviews, and students were allowed control over teacher access to the accounts they provided. Although the research team bore the major responsibility for collecting accounts during the early implementation of triangulation, Elliott has reported that the teachers themselves came to exercise considerable initiative in the process:

> As the project progressed we found that many of our teachers began to initiate triangulation procedures for themselves. They called us in, told us what to look for, and took the initiative in eliciting both our accounts and those of students, although on occasions they still asked us to interview students to check on their own progress in getting honest feedback. (*Ibid*., pp. 10-11)

Elliott reports considerable success in using this triangulation approach as a means of motivating and enabling teachers to engage in systematic, disciplined self-study. Out of 40 teachers who originally agreed to participate and 30 who remained involved through the course of the project, 24 became actively involved in studying their own practice. Of these only a minority made consistent use of all the techniques that make up triangulation. The others kept field notes and/or tape-recorded lessons. Elliott also reports a substantial increase in teachers' efforts to obtain honest feedback from their students. He reports that teachers developed interest in the generalizable aspects of their experience as they became more willing and better able to engage in reflection and self-study. Some of the teachers tested hypotheses developed through the triangulation process in their own classrooms as a support to the action research program.

Reflective Processes Developed at the Prospect School, Archive, and Center for Education and Research

The Prospect School, Archive, and Center is the source of a collection of processes designed to support ongoing examination of educational theory and practice. The collection encompasses three major types of activity in which practitioners are seen to play an essential role: (1) observation, (2) documentation, and (3) reflective conversations. These activities function both as a support to practice and as a resource for more formalized studies of children's learning. They have been developed as vehicles which practitioners, with training and guided practice, can use for self-inquiry and sharing of experiences and insights among themselves or in collaboration with personnel from other segments of the educational community (e.g., researchers, teacher educators). One particularly noteworthy feature of this case is the conception of classroom practice, teacher education (preservice and inservice), and research and inquiry as highly interrelated. Activities currently underway at the Prospect School and the Archive and Center include programs for children, professional development for educators, and research--and have at their core a view of learning as a lifelong process of inquiry and exploration and of the practitioner as an active and informed partner in this process.

Context and General Orientation. The Prospect School was founded in 1965. It currently functions as a private, nongraded school serving approximately 100 children between the ages of 4½ and 14. Informational materials developed at Prospect describe the instructional setting as an open classroom environment and place the philosophy underlying the school's general approach within the humanistic tradition: The school is committed not to a particular instructional method or curriculum, but rather to "the essential reciprocity between thought and action [based on] the observation that practice uninformed by thought, stultifies, while theory uninformed by practice is sterile" (Carini, 1978a, p. 1). Learning is conceived of as a lifelong process of inquiry and exploration, and the school is viewed as "a center for learning--not just for teaching...The teacher and the school are active and informed partners in the learning process" (Prospect School, 1979, p. 3).

The Prospect School and the Prospect Archive and Center are housed in separate facilities and maintain relatively separate staffs (totalling 19 professionals), although personnel from the School and Center interact on a frequent and regular basis. Materials describing the School and Center's programs, and interviews with School and Center staff conducted for this case study, indicate that the missions of the two institutions overlap to a considerable degree and include attention to areas of education often treated as quite separate specializations. The breadth of the shared mission is indicated in a statement describing Prospect's commitment:

> ...to the humane education of children as individuals, to the continuing professional education of teachers and other human service professionals within a philosophical perspective, to ongoing inquiry into the phenomena of human growth and learning, and to the continual improvement of documentary processes for field-based research and evaluation.
>
> (Prospect School, 1979, p. 2, emphasis added)

The Prospect Archive. An important link between the School and the Center is the Prospect Archive--a unique collection of data on children, including children's writing and art work, teachers' records, and documentation of classroom observations, amassed over the 15 years since the School's founding. Work samples and documentary records have been maintained for children enrolled at Prospect for periods of up to nine years; as a body of descriptive and documentary material on individual children, the Archive is probably unparalleled in its size (estimated at 250,000 work samples from over 300 children) and its organization (children's work and individual records are organized longitudinally by child; group or class records are maintained separately).

Observation. Observation of children in the classroom forms the basis for the record-keeping and reflective conversation processes developed at Prospect. Patricia Carini, Director of the Prospect Archive and Center, has described the orientation toward observation in a monograph entitled The Art of Seeing and the Visibility of the Person (Carini, 1979). She distinguishes her orientation toward observation from the positions commonly found in the literature on educational research.

> The scientific observer--detached, objective, at work in a laboratory equipped with standardized and complex recording instruments--is a cliche of our times. It is, in fact, so common a view that the term observer is virtually synonymous in common parlance with distance, detachment, impartiality, and neutrality. (Carini, 1979, p. 13)

The result of viewing the observer in this light, Carini argues, is that the act of observation is minimized in favor of the operation of recording:

> The observer assumes the relatively passive posture of recording according to a standardized procedure. Ideally, he records measurements provided by a refined instrumentation. Less ideally, and in the less rigorously scientific fields such as psychology, he records behaviors or traits which can later be coded numerically and made available to statistical treatment according to the same procedures applied to data gathered in the physical world. However loose or rigorous, the focus on observing within this framework is actually a focus on recording, and on devising standardized recording formats to ensure the detachment and objectivity of the observer. Observing is reduced to techniques, more or less specialized, for recording the data which the recording format or device can encompass. Thus the recording format determines what the observer sees and which aspects of the object will be available to investigation.
>
> (Ibid., pp. 14-15)

Carini explicitly challenges the notion of the "objective" oberver and of training for observers that focuses on skills of recording and classification on the basis of predetermined category schemes. The problem with a checklisting approach to observation, she argues, is that it results in reduction of the person or phenomenon into a collection of minutiae that cannot be reassembled. The result is fragmentation; the integrity of the person or phenomenon observed is irretrievably lost.

In place of the objective observer, Carini advances the concept of the reflective observer. Reflective observation requires openness, immersion in the object of observation, and repeated encounters between the observer and the observed

> ...the posture of the reflective observer is better described as simultaneously receptive and evocative. He opens himself to the object to receive it, not passively or according to a predetermined schematization, but through "repeated and varied approaches to the object in its manifold relations to himself and also tentatively tries out, as it were, a great variety of relations between the objects thus approached and other objects, ideas, experiences..." (Schachtel, 1959, p. 241). In that manifold of encounters, he calls the object forth not in order to manipulate it, intervene in it, or change it, but in order to see it in all of its dimensions, to make visible its composition and, thereby, to approach the integrity of the object.
>
> (Ibid., pp. 18-19)

It is assumed that reflective observation is most effectively carried out by persons who are most often engaged with the object to be observed. Teachers and parents are in the best position to act as observers of children, because they have the most contact with them. Seeing a child on a regular basis for long periods of time in a variety of situations, the teacher or parent is the observer most likely to detect important continuities and transformations in the individual child's interactions with the world around him or her.

In essence, Carini has suggested that adopting a posture of disciplined subjectivity will lead to more sensitive and informative observations than will striving after objectivity. Although she has discussed observation as an art rather than a technology, in her seminars she discusses the value of sharpening watching and listening skills in order to become more observant. Citing Pasteur's comment that "In the field of observation, chance favors the prepared mind," she recommends practice in observation and descriptive recording. In seminars on observation, she and other Prospect staff often ask each member of the group to observe a phenomenon or object (or similar objects) and record their impressions. Individual observers then share their writings with the group as a whole or record. These documentation activities originated as a support to the individual teacher's classroom practice; as the reflective processes (discussed below) evolved, they also came to be viewed as a support to a collective and collaborative form of professional development.

> ...there are several levels at which the observing and recording involved in documenting support teaching practice, and hence are recognized as valuable by the teacher. Most immediately and directly, the thought given to each child when the teacher reviews the week's work in order to write a descriptive record is a significant support to practice in and of itself. However, processes that bring together teachers, ancillary staff and principal to share perspectives on a child and his work, employ the continuity and multiplicity of observations and records to provide a deeper perception not only of the particular child but of all children.
>
> (Carini, 1978a, p. 2)

In addition, the documentation constitutes a rich source of information that can be used for studies of individual children and of children's treatment of various media, themes, and motifs in their work. The approach to integrating data is described in Carini (1978a). Briefly, the relevant records are arranged in chronological order and reviewed in their entirety. Themes and topics for detailed examination emerge from the record itself. Carini contrasts this approach, called "charting", to the classification schemes used in traditional research. In charting, the topics or headings are not mutually exclusive; the objective is to ascribe to each heading every piece of data that is relevant.

> The inclusiveness of the charting process identifies its differences from the categorizing of data typical of data analysis. Categorizing separates the data into mutually exclusive categories, in which, by definition, a given datum can only be subsumed to one category. Further, the category subsumes the particular datum, and it exists once categorized only as a special case of the general category. Thus, where charting particularizes and makes visible the phenomenon itself, categorization generalizes and abstracts it as a special case of a broader category of events.
>
> (Carini, 1978a, p. 10)

Reflection. The third major component of the processes developed by Carini and her colleagues is the reflective conversation.

> Reflection is thinking which gathers, keeps, and perserves thought by finding the pattern of relationship among seemingly disparate events. It is, therefore, a special branch of remembering which consciously chooses a focus to concentrate on—a subject which may be an idea, an image, a motif, a symbol, an experience, a person, an event, or anything.
>
> (Carini, 1979, p. 30)

A variety of formats for reflective conversations have been developed,* but most of them share several features. First is the notion of focus. The reflective conversation has at its center a focusing issue or question, which is identified at the outset. The focus or topic for reflection may be a teacher's uncertainty as to how to approach a problem related to an individual child, a child's drawing or painting, or a controversial issue faced by the entire faculty. Second is the notion of multiple perspectives. As with Elliott's (1977) triangulation model, it is assumed that diversity of perspectives is beneficial in terms of expanding the range of experience, insights, and alternative courses of action that can be brought to bear on an issue or problem. Unlike the triangulation approach, the reflective processes developed at Prospect do not explicitly require inclusion of persons other than teachers (although nonteachers can be included). At Prospect the staff meets on a weekly basis for Staff Review of a Child or one of the other formats. Carini and her colleagues suggest that groups of about 8 to 12 are optimal for most of the reflective processes. When groups exceed about 20, the process may become unwieldy; in such cases, the group can be divided into two groups.

Third is the notion of structure. In addition to a focusing question, the reflective processes share certain structural features. Individual participants play specific roles (presenting teacher, chair, recorder, other participant) assigned in advance, and responsible for carrying out particular functions. Discussion proceeds according to a general outline or format* and adheres to agreed-upon rules and standards. An important rule is respect for the privacy of the child and his/her family. Use of clinical or categorical labels to describe a child is discouraged; description focuses instead on explicit physical, emotional, and behavioral considerations. Likewise, family information is included only if it has been provided to the school by the family directly.

---

* The collection of processes is presented in Prospect Archive and Center, "Descriptive Documentary Processes and Formats," April 1980. Examples include Staff Review of a Child, Staff Review of an Issue, Teacher's Review of Practice, Teacher's Review of a Classroom, and Principal's Review of a School.

Fourth is the notion of implications and recommendations. Reflective conversations begin with a focusing question; an important aim is to develop, within the group, recommendations for action in response to this question. The intent is not to mandate specific action, or even necessarily to reach complete agreement within the group, but rather to inform, clarify, and offer recommendations to the presenting teacher. The teacher is not obligated to follow the recommendations; however, he/she is expected to report back to the group at a later date on actions taken and their apparent results.

Fifth, and finally, is the notion of staff development for all participants as an additional aim of these processes. In Staff Review of a Child, for example, the focus is an individual child, and the recommendations are offered to the child's teacher. However, it is assumed that the benefits of the discussion extend beyond the individual child and teacher, contributing to the professional development of all participants "by bringing a professional staff together on a regular basis to address their common interest and commitment: children. From this ongoing study of individual children, knowledge of human development in general and of the uniqueness of each child's perspective is extended and deepened" (Prospect Archive and Center, 1980, p. 3).

---

* As an example, Staff Review of the Child has five basic steps: (1) Presenting the Child (the chair identifies the focusing question and the presenting teacher describes the child's physical presence, disposition, relationships with others, preferred activities, involvement in learning, etc.); (2) Historical Perspective (the chair summarizes information available from earlier records); (3) Extension of Presentation and Discussion (other group members comment on the child and ask for additional information); (4) Recommendations from members of the group and response from the teacher; and (5) Critique of the process. The chair provides a summary at the end of each step; the notetaker maintains a written record.

Professional Development Programs. In addition to the programs offered for children at the Prospect School, a variety of adult education programs have been developed to make the techniques originated at Prospect available on a wider scale. These programs include offerings for preservice and inservice teachers alike. The 10-month certification program, The Prospect School Teacher Education Program (described in Prospect School, 1979) was approved by the Vermont Department of Education in 1974 as a field-based program for certification in elementary education. The orientation underlying this preservice program is described in the brochure on the program as follows:

> The preparation described here is intended to promote teacher autonomy conceived as long-term growth in thought, the gradual perfecting of skills in classroom practice, and increasing imagination in evolving curriculum. Through practice in public school settings and exposure to the varying curricular, skill, and organizational demands of those settings, teacher interns are prepared to begin from the prescribed structures of public schools and gradually to work toward a more personally oriented setting. The idea of teaching promulgated here is that teaching is fundamentally and essentially a human relationship, and therefore an art rather than a technology, and equally that the function of the school is to render the scholar fully conscious of the nature and inner life of things and of himself.
>
> (Prospect School, 1979, p. 7)

A 10-month Program for Experienced Professionals is also available. This program (described in Prospect School, 1979) offers practicing teachers and other education professionals the opportunity to observe in Prospect School's classrooms, to participate in the School's staff development program (weekly sessions devoted to the reflective conversations discussed below), to make use of the Archive, and to receive training and experience (through seminars and independent research) in methods of research and disciplined inquiry (classroom observation, record-keeping, data analysis and integration, and development of documentary studies of children, curriculum, and programs).

In addition to the full-year preservice and inservice programs, the Prospect Center has conducted yearly Summer Institutes since 1970. These two- and three-week residential programs serve up to 50 teachers and other educational professionals, combining study and practice in the

Center's processes for observation, documentation, and reflection with thematic seminars. Finally, practitioners from a number of school systems have been introduced to the processes developed at Prospect for professional development and improvement of practice through two- and three-day workshops conducted in various locations (mainly in the Northeast). Several of these awareness-level workshops were hosted by teacher centers (e.g., Workshop Center for Open Education, New York City; Teachers Learning Cooperative, Philadelphia; Teacher Shelter, Oakland). A nucleus of teachers was available at each of these centers that already had experience using some of the record-keeping and reflective processes. Finally, Prospect staff have contracted with several school systems and teacher centers to provide professional development workshops and programs (e.g., for teachers in the Educational Development Center's Follow Through program in Paterson and Philadelphia).

Research Activities. The third major emphasis of activities at Prospect is research and inquiry. Research undertaken at the Center has been focused on the person, and the person's experience over time, as the unit of study. Studies carried out at the Center have used the children's work and teacher records from the Archive as a major resource and have examined such topics as the child as reader (Carini, 1978b) and children's treatment of various media and motifs in their work. The Archive is available to outside individuals (education professionals and advanced-degree students) through the Research Collaborative Program. Involvement of Prospect Center staff in research projects initiated by external institutions (local and state education agencies, research organizations, etc.) is arranged through consulting contracts. Two major research efforts in which Prospect Center staff have participated are the five-year study of the New York State Bureau of Child Development's state-wide pre-Kindergarten program and the Collaborative Research Project on Reading being conducted by the Early Education Group at the Educational Testing Service (Chittendon & Bussis, 1979; Bussis, 1980). In both cases Prospect staff have provided training and assistance to practitioners in the use of techniques for record keeping, in-depth study of individual children, and integration of data. These techniques have been adapted from the processes originally designed to support practice.

CHAPTER 4

PRACTITIONER INVOLVEMENT IN THE SHARING AND UTILIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE

In Chapter 3, we reviewed several efforts to involve school-based practitioners more directly in the development of knowledge through research and disciplined inquiry. In this chapter, we shift the focus to practitioners' involvement in the sharing and utilization of knowledge. Knowledge utilization and improvement-oriented change in education have been the subject of a growing body of research during the past decade. Rather than attempt a comprehensive review of this literature, we will focus on two lines of research directly related to facilitation of the knowledge utilization process and improved understanding of practitioners' roles in the process.

The first is research on the delivery or communication of research results and products to practitioners as a means of addressing locally identified questions and concerns. The Pilot State Dissemination Program evaluated by Sieber, Louis, & Metzger (1972) is described as an example of this line of research; some additional findings from more recent studies of efforts to bring research results to practitioners are also discussed. The second line of research moves beyond the delivery of information to examine the process of knowledge utilization and improvement-oriented change among practitioners. The Rand study of federal programs supporting educational change is a major example of research that points to the practitioner as a key figure in the process of change. The Emrick et al. (1977) study of the National Diffusion Network examined practitioners' involvement in the sharing of knowledge and improvements developed in practice settings.

Delivery of Research Results and Products

One of the earliest major efforts to bring practitioners into direct contact with research results and products, with the goal of improving practice, was the Pilot State Dissemination Program (PSDP), begun in 1970.

Underlying the PSDP was the assumption that information and products developed through research are potentially relevant to the improvement of practice but that school-based practitioners lack ready access to such information. Solving the access problem, it was reasoned, would give practitioners information which they could then use to update their methods and materials of instruction. To solve the access problem, the PSDP established computerized information systems centralized at the state level and assigned field agent intermediaries to work directly with a small number of school systems in the three participating states. The field agents' basic functions were to help practitioners clarify their information needs and priorities, request relevant materials from the centralized information system, and deliver the information to the requestor. The evolution and functioning of the program over a period of two years were studied by Sieber, Louis, & Metzger (1972).

Sieber, Louis, & Metzger concluded that field agent intermediaries are essential to efforts aimed at making research results and products readily available to practitioners. When requests received at the information centers over a five-month period were analyzed, Sieber et al. found that significantly more requests were received from districts served by intermediaries than from other comparable districts. In particular, the number of requests for information from classroom teachers was substantially higher in the districts with field agents. The key to the agents' success, the evaluators concluded, was their status as "generalist[s] without authority whose presence is legitimized by the provision of information" (p. 11).

On the basis of case studies of individual agents in the field, Sieber et al. developed a number of conclusions regarding the problems faced by outside intermediaries attempting to work with school personnel, and tactics used by the field agents to overcome these problems. One of the first lessons learned by the field agents was that gaining access to classroom-based practitioners was far from automatic; initial contacts with both district and school administrators were needed. In a review of the PSDP study and several other investigations of large-scale improvement-oriented change efforts, Emrick & Peterson (1978a) point to the need for interventionists to secure "informed concurrence" of senior administrators at both the district and the building level prior to contacting practitioners directly.

A second lesson cited by the PSDP evaluators involves the need to win the interest and confidence of the practitioners themselves. The teachers, the agents discovered, were not eagerly awaiting the latest research results or ready, willing, and able to communicate to strangers their needs and problems. The field agents found that it took time to build personal relationships and gain the trust of their practitioner clients.

Cope & Gray have described the "legacy of suspicion" (1979, p. 241) surrounding research. Practitioners (often correctly) view research as somethings universities "do" to schools, with benefits accruing only to the researcher. Persons from outside the school system are viewed skeptically, particularly by school personnel who have a history of interactions with outsiders who failed to deliver on promises of dramatic improvement based on the latest research. Legitimacy and credibility are key issues. Sieber, Louis, & Metzger suggested that information served to establish the intermediary's legitimacy. The intermediary who brings with him/her access to information on a wide variety of potentially relevant topics and who lacks the power to mandate change will probably be tolerated. But credibility appeared to be associated mainly with characteristics of the intermediary himself/herself. Intermediaries in a variety of improvement-oriented change projects have found that it takes time, flexibility, effort, and interpersonal skills to establish the credibility needed to work effectively with their clients.

One important factor was the degree of similarity in language, experience, and perspective between the agent and his or her client. Sieber, Louis, & Metzger concluded that the agents' teaching backgrounds were important to their success; teaching experience was also cited as an important qualification for intermediaries planning to work with teachers by Nolan & Roper (1977) and Emrick & Peterson (1978a). Another factor was continued visibility and availability of the agents on the school site--in the classroom, the faculty room, etc.; this factor was also identified as important by Nolan & Roper (1977).

The PSDP evaluators concluded that intermediaries need a repertoire of roles (e.g., conveyor of information, change agent) and the ability to shift rapidly from one role to another as the situation demands. Successful intermediaries performed "boundary-spanning" functions—integrating information from various sources and adjusting features of their own strategies to become more responsive to their client populations. In subsequent studies of intermediaries working in school systems, Moore et al. (1977), Bawden, Florio, & Wanous (1980), and others have concluded that intermediaries must be willing to take on "marginal" roles, relatively isolated from the organizations they represent (e.g., the university, SEA) but not part of the institutions they serve (e.g., the school system).

The major impact addressed at the practitioner level in the PSDP study was the stimulation of information-seeking behavior. Whether and how the information ultimately influenced classroom practice received little direct attention. In a subsequent reanalysis of self-report questionnaire data from information requesters, Louis & Sieber (1979) classified respondents according to four levels of use of the information received: implementer (some reported use), 22%; planner (reported intent to use), 19%; absorber (reported reading the material), 37%; and non-user (reported not reading or reading and rejecting the material), 22%. These findings suggest that stimulating awareness and interest among practitioners does not necessarily lead to changes in practice, although it may be an appropriate early stage in improvement-oriented change efforts (Emrick & Peterson, 1978a).

Some additional issues relevant to programs aimed at bringing research results and products to practitioners as a means for improving practice are addressed in reports on more recent efforts that make use of intermediaries based in universities and other institutions outside school systems. Karen Louis and her colleagues at Abt Associates have studied the Research and Development Utilization program, one of several efforts supported by the National Institute of Education's Regional Program that have been intended to facilitate practitioners' use of research products for addressing their own questions and concerns. In a paper presenting some early results of the R&DU study, which is still underway, Louis (1980) identifies quality control as a key issue. According to Louis, the intervention projects she studied encountered difficulties in developing and applying quality control standards to research products, largely because of the gaps in existing knowledge bases and pools of information available. At the same time, she concluded that development of some systematic procedures and standards for screening research products prior to delivering them to practitioners was a key feature shared by successful programs supporting local improvement through utilization of knowledge developed in other settings. "Despite the dilemmas associated with applying quality control procedures to the development of a knowledge base, these quality control procedures may be one of the single most important facturs determining project outcomes" (Louis, 1980, p. 9).

Nolan & Roper (1977) describe a two-year Teacher Corps project based in an urban junior high school, in which university-based personnel worked directly with practitioners to identify concerns and interests, locate relevant research products and other external sources of information, and apply the information to practice. On the basis of their efforts, which were focused on helping school staff adjust to the demands and possibilities of working in a new open-space setting, Nolan & Roper suggest a number of guidelines for intermediaries. Like the PSDP evaluators, they emphasize the need to establish credibility with the practitioners through learning as much as possible about the school, maintaining a continued presence on site, and demonstrating early on that the intermediary can help the teachers solve some immediate problem. In addition, they point to the importance of combining research products with other sources of information. They identify practice-based sources as particularly important, recommending visits to other schools for demonstrations and discussions with experienced practitioners. They also recommend continued attention to logistical and operational concerns--demonstrating respect for teachers' time, updating needs assessments periodically, screening outside consultants before bringing them in to work with practitioners, and trying to accomplish some objectives quickly in order to build momentum. Finally, Nolan & Roper recommend that intermediaries set up procedures for involving their practitioner clients in making decisions about services wanted and activities to pursue and that they encourage the practitioners to assume leadership roles in efforts directed at improvement.

Research on Knowledge Utilization and Improvement-Oriented Change

One response to the uneven productivity of reform and improvement efforts in education has been to seek new approaches to change that are better grounded in the reality of the practitioner's world. Sieber (1972, 1974) and Doyle & Ponder (1977) have reasoned that most efforts to improve practice through utilization of information and innovations developed outside school settings fail because they are based on inaccurate assumptions and images of the practitioner. According to Sieber, research on educational innovation "fails to penetrate the mental world of the practitioner in order to reflect definition of needs, problem-solving patterns, knowledge translation strategies, criteria for appraisal of options, perceptions of experts and other outsiders" (1974, p. 66). Among the more common approaches to change are those that rely on rational models and those that employ power-coercive strategies. Doyle & Ponder have observed that rational models are generally based on assumptions about how the change process ought to work in a rational world: Specifically, the educator bases decisions on the best available information about the results of alternative courses of action. Strategies based on rational models emphasize information as the major catalyst for change. However, the yield of such strategies is generally low. Practitioners are people, and they base their decisions on a host of considerations, not all of which are rational; even after a decision to use some new practice or program is made, various organizational constraints, group pressures, and other factors can interfere with implementation.

Power-coercive strategies are based on less optimistic images of the practitioner as a "powerless functionary" (Sieber, 1972, p. 373) or a "stone-age obstructionist" (Doyle & Ponder, 1977, p. 4). Such efforts assume that change can be mandated, or that the teacher can be bypassed in programs directed at improvement. Results of efforts in this vein have been mixed. Although mandated change has sometimes led to reform, it has also led to many instances of what Sieber terms "ritualistic compliance" (1972), p. 378) and what others have called the "project mentality."

Although Sieber argues that approaches based on rational models or employing power-coercive tactics are often unsuccessful, he does suggest that certain elements of these approaches may be useful. Strategies based on combinations of elements from these and other common orientations offer promise for efforts intended to promote directed change. Specifically, he suggests that change strategies grounded in a more accurate image of the practitioner would include:

> - rational (i.e., validated) information;
> - two-way interpersonal communication and expertise in group process;
> - consensus on new norms and sanctions associated with a proposed change; and
> - identification of a person responsible for the innovation who has legitimate authority and the power to carry it through.
>
> (Sieber, 1972, p. 380)

Doyle & Ponder argue that the great majority of change strategies described in the literature lack any firm foundation in an understanding of practitioners' perspectives; there is little connection between prescriptions as to how knowledge utilization should occur in a given effort and descriptions of how the process actually operates. They suggest that a more effective approach to developing knowledge utilization and change strategies is to examine how teachers actually respond to proposed changes in their classroom practices, structures, and habits. In particular, they cite the need for consideration of the ecology of the classroom and its interaction with teacher behaviors. What demands does the classroom environment make on the teacher, and how do these demands influence teachers' thinking and responses to information products and innovations developed in other settings?

Doyle (1977) describes the classroom as a complex environment, characterized by:

- Multidimensionality--variety in tasks, processes and purposes, not all of which are necessarily related or even compatible.
- Simultaneity--numerous events occurring at the same time and requiring attention from the teacher.
- Unpredictability--the ever-present possibility of disruptions to the task at hand, generated internally, as when students fail to respond or respond in ways not anticipated, or externally, as when visitors enter the room or equipment breaks down.

Based on their studies of teachers, Doyle & Ponder have developed a view of practitioners as "pragmatic skeptics" who weigh considerations of practicality in their judgments of innovations and change proposals. The dimensions of practicality identified by Doyle & Ponder include:

- Instrumentality--inclusion of concrete procedural and operational detail rather than just abstract principles and objectives.
- Congruence--compatibility with the teacher's values, beliefs, and perceptions of his/her own classroom situation.
- Cost--the apparent ratio between benefits and effort.

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model developed by Gene Hall and others at the University of Texas at Austin also reflects an attempt to develop an improved understanding of practitioners' responses to innovations and to use this understanding to facilitate knowledge utilization efforts. The model addresses practitioner perspectives within the context of a given innovation and includes two components--the Stages of Concern, which focuses on feelings and affective states, and the Levels of Use, which focuses on performance. It is assumed that an individual practitioner will exhibit different patterns of concerns and behaviors over time, depending on the extent of his/her involvement and experience with an innovation. Further, within a group of teachers targeted for participation in a change effort, concerns and behaviors are assumed to vary across individuals at any particular point in time. The CBAM approach has identified six dimensions or areas of concern that arise among practitioners (see Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1977):

- Informational--general interest in learning about the substantive features of the innovation.
- Personal--concern with implications for oneself; for example, modifications or changes in the individual's role and status within the overall school organization induced by use of the innovation.
- Management--concern with the task requirements imposed by the innovation; e.g., modifications or changes required in day-to-day classroom routines.
- Consequence--interest in impacts on students within the individual's immediate sphere of influence.
- Collaboration--concern with implications related to social-interactive needs, associated with increased isolation or desire to collaborate with others.

- Refocusing--interest in exploring alternative forms of the innovation, making major changes, or replacing it with some other program in order to produce greater or more widespread benefits to students.

The Levels of Use dimension (see Loucks, Newlove, & Hall, 1975) posits a continuum of use states. This continuum ranges from non-use through rudimentary, disjointed early use into consistent, routine use and ultimately to more advanced levels in which the user attempts to increase the effectiveness of the innovation by making refinements and modifications. Not all targeted users of an innovation will reach the advanced levels, but they will generally pass through stages in the same sequence.

The concerns and use dimensions developed by Hall et al. and the practicality ethic described by Doyle & Ponder represent attempts to ground our understanding of the knowledge utilization process, and our attempts to facilitate the process, in a view of how practitioners actually respond to change initiatives and innovations. The dimensions they have identified are not innovation specific; they can be applied to a variety of knowledge utilization programs.

Sieber (1972), Doyle & Ponder (1977), and Hall et al. (1977) agrue that we need to reconsider the rational model and knowledge utilization strategies based on images of practitioners that are idealistic or overly simplistic. However, their work does not explicitly challenge the division of labor that commonly characterizes the process of knowledge production and utilization in education. Doyle & Ponder and Hall acknowledge the inevitability and legitimacy of local adaptation to innovations that have been developed in other settings. They do not necessarily imply that program development must take place within school settings or that practitioners themselves should assume the major responsibility for the process of developing and disseminating educational innovations.*
Implications of their work are directed primarily to program developers and change facilitators, who may be university personnel, state education agency representatives, district resource personnel, or practicing teachers.

---

* This work certainly does not preclude the possibility of practitioner-developed innovations either.

Their approaches allow for considerable program development to occur *prior* to implementation, with or without involvement of practitioners.

A somewhat different orientation to promoting school improvement and reform through knowledge utilization is based on the assumption that information generated through research must undergo considerable development and transformation before its relevance to improvement of practice can be demonstrated. Further, this development process must occur with the school setting, with practitioners as active participants throughout the process. Probably the most extensive and best-known presentation of this orientation is found in the eight-volume study by Rand researchers of federal programs supporting educational change.

Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. In this study, Paul Berman, Milbrey McLaughlin, and their colleagues at Rand examined four major federal seed money initiatives supporting program development efforts within school systems. Data were collected for this multiyear investigation through structured interview surveys of teachers and administrators at 293 local project sites and more intensive case studies at 24 of the sites during their last or next-to-last year of federal seed money support. Follow-up work was conducted two years later involving 100 sites to examine continuation of activities initiated within the local projects. In examining the effectiveness of federal initiatives as a stimulus for innovation and school improvement, the Rand researchers focused their attention on the basic processes that unfolded in response to the federally supported change initiatives and identified a number of factors that were systematically associated with success or failure.

One of the major conclusions reached in this study was the prominence of *local factors* in determining the success and long-term survival of reform efforts. The limited role of federal policies is discussed in Volume IV:

> Federal change agent policies had their primary effect on the initiation of projects but...neither those policies that were unique to each of the federal programs nor those policies that were common to them had a strong influence on the implementation of local innovations. Federal change agent policies exercised limited leverage on the course of innovations because they did not critically influence those factors most responsible for effective implementation.
>
> (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975, p. 24)

By contrast, several classes of local factors were identified as major influences on the change process and its outcomes, including:

- Characteristics of the institutional setting, particularly the district's motivation for initiating the project and local leadership capability;
- The implementation strategy that local personnel followed in translating project plans into practice;
- The scope of change that the project represented, given existing practices and norms within the local setting; and
- Characteristics of project teachers.

Implementation processes and strategies were a major focus of the study. Implementation was defined as the stage at which "the project confronts the reality of its institutional setting and project plans must be translated into practice" (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976, p. 349). Implementation strategy basically refers to means used by local project leaders to guide and support the implementation process. In general, successfully implemented projects were characterized by strategies that promoted *mutual adaptation*--a process in which the project's original goals and methods are modified to suit the needs and interests of participants and the participants themselves change to meet the requirements of the project (McLaughlin, 1977, p. 341). Characteristic features of successful implementation strategies included:

- Staff training focused on practical aspects of project operations and continuing throughout the period of project implementation;
- High levels of additional support activities for participants (e.g., visits to demonstration classrooms, observation of implementation efforts and feedback from project leaders or consultants who provided concrete, practical advice);
- Frequent meetings of project staff;
- Involvement of participants in decisions affecting project operations;
- Development of materials by local participants;
- Involvement of highly motivated staff (particularly during the early part of implementation) who volunteered to participate and, in some cases, were selected by project leaders as "most likely to succeed;"
- Targeting of change efforts to elementary schools; and
- Participation of a "critical mass" of participants.

The above list reflects the critical importance of active involvement of, and commitment from, practitioner participants. As McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) argue in a review of findings from the study, "The importance of teacher commitment to the achievement of project goals is axiomatic: Project success is unlikely unless teachers want to work hard to make it happen" (p. 72). They concluded further that practitioners' involvement and commitment are influenced by other factors; it is not simply a matter of some teachers being eager for change while others are highly resistant.

McLaughlin & Marsh concluded that the primary factors influencing teacher commitment and involvement are motivation of district managers, project planning strategies, and scope of the proposed change. Teachers were more likely to exert the extra effort required for successful implementation when they felt that the project was seen as important at the district level. Without clear district support, teachers tended to view the personal costs associated with the change efforts as incompatible with their own professional self-interest. Collaborative planning strategies, involving equal opportunities for input from project managers and teacher participants,were also found to be effective in stimulating commitment. According to McLaughlin & Marsh, these strategies rarely reflected self-conscious attention to considerations of parity, but they allowed teachers to see themselves as partners in the planning process and to develop a sense of identification and ownership. Planning that was carried out exclusively by project management (the top-down approach) or exclusively by the teachers themselves (the grass-roots approach) was rarely successful. Collaborative planning, although relatively time consuming, generated the broad-based support necessary for effective implementation and sustained change.

Variations between funding levels and sources were not found to exert a major influence on teachers' motivation or on successful implementation. Neither did the source of the original idea for the project; projects conceived in the central office fared about as well as projects initiated by classroom teachers or other school personnel. However, the scope of change was found to be important. Berman (1977) has phrased this conclusion succinctly: "Little ventured, nothing gained." Efforts viewed by participants as trivial failed to elicit commitment or change. Projects that did attempt to influence teacher behavior, on the other hand, were viewed by teachers as opportunities for professional growth. Efforts that appealed to practitioners' sense of professionalism and offered the intrinsic reward of growth were more successful than those that relied exclusively on extrinsic rewards. A related finding involves the importance of the teacher's sense of efficacy—the belief that he/she can help even the most difficult or unmotivated students. Strong positive relationships were found between sense of efficacy and a variety of project outcomes.

Although the study pointed to the central role played by practicing teachers throughout the implementation process, it also emphasized the important role of district- and building-level administration. The Rand researchers concluded that district-level commitment was necessary from the outset; where it was not secured early, it failed to emerge later. Projects initiated out of "opportunistic" motives generated little or no enthusiasm on the part of teachers, produced little change in practice, and almost never survived the withdrawal of federal seed money. Support from principals was especially important in influencing district-level decisions regarding continuation.

Local leadership capability also exerted a strong influence on the fate of the projects. Successful implementation required local leaders with skills in the content area(s) covered by the projects and with the organizational and interpersonal skills needed to work well with teachers, principals, and district-level personnel. Long-term continuation of improvements generated as part of the projects was rare; where it occurred, project management had recognized from the outset the full implications of the project's "soft money" status and had begun planning for institutionalization very early.

Another major conclusion to come out of the study involved the declining success rate of local change efforts as attention shifted from early stages in the change process to later stages. Local initiation of improvement-oriented change projects did not guarantee successful implementation, and implementation success did not by itself assure the long-term survival of improvements. Berman & McLaughlin (1977) describe continuation as a locally determined process in which decisions are made at two levels--the classroom and the district. Again, teacher commitment and involvement, combined with commitment and support from the district, are the critical influences.

> At the classroom level, the crux of the matter is the extent to which teachers have *assimilated* project methods or materials into their regular classroom practice. At the district level, the issue is the district's commitment to the long-term stability of the project. This commitment requires the *incorporation* of project requirements into such district operations as budget, personnel, curriculum, and facilities planning.
>
> In the end, however, effective continuation depends on the choices and behavior of classroom teachers. Unless they have assimilated project methods or materials into their classroom activities, continuation will amount to no more than ritual. But if they are to receive the support they need to sustain project-related changes in the long run, the district at its level must incorporate the necessary arrangements.
>
> (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977, pp. 185-6)

The National Diffusion Network. An assumption underlying the seed money programs studied by Rand was that innovations developed in local school settings would spread to other schools and districts. However, the Rand researchers found very little evidence that innovations and practices developed within the local projects had spread beyond district boundaries. In 1974, the U.S. Office of Education established the National Diffusion Network (NDN) as a means of making improvements developed in local school settings and validated by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel available to other school systems. The NDN differs from most of the other "delivery systems" established during the 1970s to promote knowledge utilization for the improvement of practice in that it has focused on creating direct linkages between practitioners from different school systems. Practitioners are involved in the NDN delivery system in several key capacities: They represent the *sources* or originators of the innovations; they function as *change agents* with major responsibility for providing training, technical assistance, and supporting materials to personnel from other school systems interested in using their innovations; and they constitute the primary *audience* for communication of operating detail and "know-how" by the innovation developers.

A national study of the NDS was reported by Emrick, Peterson, & Agarwala-Rogers (1977). The study examined the NDN's emergence and early history and its distinctive organizational features as well as the tactics used by NDN change agents to promote the spread of the validated innovations. Emrick et al. cite as a distinctive organizational feature of the NDN its combination of two categories of change agent: the Developer and the Facilitator. Developers are often based in school systems, and each is associated with one of the validated innovations. The NDN innovations and their Developers represent successful applications of federal initiatives supporting local program development--including the four programs studied by Rand. Facilitators, by contrast, do not function as program or technical experts but rather as brokers and process specialists. Associated with a geographic region rather than a particular innovation, a Facilitator is usually based in a state- or intermediate-level agency; Facilitators assist in identifying LEA clients for the innovations and support the adoption and implementation processes. Emrick et al. characterize the NDN as a combination of *practitioner experts* (the Developers), who bring instructional know-how gained over several years of intensive involvement with a particular innovation, and *process specialists* (the Facilitators), who bring experience in educational administration and/or dissemination and, in many cases, previous linkages to key personnel in state, intermediate, and local education agencies. Distinctive operating features of the NDN include emphasis on person-intensive change tactics and allowance for local adaptation of the innovations.

In a review of findings from the study, Emrick & Peterson (1978a) describe the NDN as "one of the few highly successful federal efforts to make wide-scale use of important developmental improvements in educational state-of-the-art" (p. 36). The combined efforts of the Developers and Facilitators were successful in generating widespread awareness of the programs and services available, stimulating interest and activity on the part of school and district personnel, providing materials and training assistance to school staff planning to make use of the programs, and following up with implementation assistance and support. Implementation was reported in a majority of the nearly 1500 LEAs surveyed by

Emrick et al.; practitioners interviewed in a sample of these locations expressed positive views of the programs and generally expected their implementations to continue..

A process-outcome analysis using survey data from Developers and Facilitators and key contacts in the districts they worked with identified a number of apparent determinants of the effectiveness of the NDN change agents, including the following:

- Staged outreach campaigns, in which varieties of awareness materials are circulated selectively to different segments of the educational community and followed up with personal contacts and more detailed information for those expressing interest.
- Early involvement of administrative and instructional decision-makers within the client schools.
- Coordinated "awareness" conferences at which LEA representatives can learn about several alternative programs relevant to their interests and priorities and meet the originators of these programs.
- The interpersonal style of the Developer.
- Resource/organizational support provided by the Facilitator (mainly in terms of securing administrative concurrence and enabling LEA personnel to visit demonstration sites).
- Attention to securing agreement on the part of all three organizations (the Developer, the Facilitator, and the LEA client) as to the commitments each was willing to make.
- Visits by LEA staff to demonstration sites that represented working models and referents for the innovations in operation.
- Training of key instructional and administrative staff by the LEA-based originators of the programs, covering both the concrete operating detail and the philosophical underpinnings of the innovations.
- Emphasis on practitioner change and growth, as opposed to use of a specific set of materials, as the key factor in improvement-oriented change.
- Use of comprehensive, well-oriented materials prepared by Developer staff to supplement training.
- Phase-in of implementation, beginning with only a few interested and competent staff and gradually extending to others in the site.
- Return visits by Developer and Facilitator staff to provide technical assistance and moral support.

CHAPTER 5

PRACTITIONER INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING AND SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

In Chapter 2, above, reference was made to theories of job satisfaction and, in particular, to hypothesized relationships between working conditions, management approaches, and employees' job satisfaction. Much of the literature concerning these theories reports results of studies undertaken in business and industrial environments. However, a number of researchers have undertaken studies in school settings to investigate the possibility of connections between working conditions and teachers' job satisfaction. A topic of particular interest in these studies has been the relationship between school practitioners' level of involvement in decision-making processes and the degree of satisfaction they derive from their jobs.

These studies have relied heavily on survey research methodology (mainly self-report questionnaires administered to teachers and principals) and statistical analysis techniques. Researchers conducting these studies have attempted to develop indicators of involvement and job satisfaction and then to examine through correlational analysis the statistical relationships among the measures. Two general approaches to measuring participation have been used. The first is to generate an index of current participation (e.g., frequency of involvement, level of influence). Examples of this approach include Ambrosie & Heller (1972), Bridges (1964), Chase (1952), and Gorton (1971). The second is to examine the discrepancy between current and desired (ideal) involvement; in these studies, teachers are classified as decisionally deprived (participating in fewer decision areas than desired), decisionally saturated (participating in more decision areas than desired), or in decisional equilibrium (participating in as many decisions as desired. Examples of studies using the discrepancy approach include Belasco & Alutto (1972), Isherwood & Taylor (1978), and Mohrman et al. (1978).

Strong positive correlations between teachers' reports of having opportunities for input to school decisions and their levels of job satisfaction have been reported by Chase (1952), Hornstein et al. (1968), Mohrman et al. (1978), and Sharma (1955). Two studies using the discrepancy approach to measuring involvement--Belasco & Alutto (1972) and Isherwood & Taylor (1978)--produced generally similar results. In Belasco & Alutto's (1972) survey of elementary and secondary teachers in two New York districts, respondents classified as decisionally deprived (participating in fewer decisions than desired) reported significantly less satisfaction with their jobs in general than did other teachers. Within the group of decisionally deprived teachers, those reporting small discrepancies were more satisfied with their jobs than were teachers who wanted substantially more opportunity to participate in decision processes than they were currently experiencing.

In a study conducted in secondary schools in Quebec, Isherwood & Taylor (1978) used three different measures of teachers' job satisfaction; they did not find a signficant relationship between decisional deprivation and teacher rewards or teacher/student relationships. However, they did detect a significant correlation between decisional deprivation and teacher/principal relations. Specifically, teachers for whom actual and ideal levels of involvement were about the same reported better relationships with their principals. This relationship held both for teachers serving on faculty councils at the 20 schools surveyed and for the teachers not on the councils. Bridges (1964) and Hornstein et al. (1968) have also reported positive correlations between teachers' reported decision involvement and relationships with their principals. However, in Bridges' study, conducted in 28 elementary schools in a midwestern district, the factor most highly correlated with teachers' attitudes toward their principal was the teacher's perception of the principal's supportiveness toward teachers (the extent to which the principal would back the teacher in a dispute, for example, with a parent).

The correlational studies are generally consistent with findings from investigations in industrial settings that support hypothesized relationships between involvement in decisions that affect working conditions and job satisfaction. However, they offer relatively little guidance to administrators or staff development personnel interested in the professional development implications of bringing teachers into active roles in school decision-making. In particular, correlational evidence alone cannot establish the direction of a cause/effect relationship, if one exists. One interpretation of the evidence is that teachers are more satisfied with their jobs because they have been given a voice in decision making; however, an alternative interpretation is that teachers who are relatively satisfied with their current assignments are more likely to pursue opportunities for decision involvement than less satisfied teachers, who may be directing their energies to other ways of resolving their immediate concerns. Further, the correlational studies are not particularly informative with respect to how practitioners have been involved in school decision making (the types of decisions in which they have been involved and the level of influence they have exercised). The studies have not been focused on the question of how to bring practitioners into more active roles (the types and level of support needed to increase involvement, the obstacles that have emerged, and ways they have been resolved). Finally, the correlational studies do not by and large address the staff development implications of efforts to increase involvement (the types of training needed by practitioners and the consequences of involvement in terms of professional growth and improvement of practice).

Reports on efforts undertaken for the specific purpose of increasing practitioners' involvement in school decision making are relatively uncommon in the literature, and systematic studies of such efforts are even rarer. In the remainder of this chapter, three projects that have attempted to bring school practitioners into more active participation in decision making are described. Two are ongoing Teacher Corps (Program 78) projects: the Akron (Ohio) Public Schools/Community/Kent State University project and the McKinley Complex project based in Honolulu, Hawaii. These projects represent attempts to involve school personnel, along with university staff and community members, in the planning and implementation of staff development programs. The third case is the Teacher Involvement Project, implemented in San Jose, California, over a period of three years with support from the National Institute of Education's Local Problem Solving program. This project represents an attempt to develop mechanisms for involving practitioners in decision making at the school level—faculty councils and constitutions—with the scope and emphasis of practitioners' decision involvement a subject for negotiation between a given faculty and their principal.

Akron/Kent State Teacher Corps Project

The Akron Public Schools/Community/Kent State University Teacher Corps project has adapted John Elliott's triangulation model as a systematic approach to collaboration among the school, community, and university in the design and implementation of staff development programs. This case is particularly interesting in that the project staff have taken an approach originally developed to support practitioner involvement in knowledge production (see Chapter 3) and adapted it for use mainly as a device to facilitate practitioner involvement in program decision making. The case is instructive with respect to the requirements for collaboration involving the three major stakeholder groups within the Teacher Corps. community as well as the formats and content of staff development programs that emerge as a result of collaborative planning.

Context.* The Akron/Kent State Teacher Corps project serves the North Hill Cluster feeder system within the Akron Public Schools. Over the past decade, the city of Akron has been faced with a situation that has become increasingly common within major urban areas—a changing, but generally declining, school-aged population as a result of several local plant closings. Declining enrollment of white children in the city's schools, combined with the closing of several schools in older, relatively homogeneous neighborhoods, have contributed to greater ethnic and cultural diversity in the student populations at some of the city's schools.

The North Hill Cluster includes two elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school. The community it serves includes a mix of black and white. The two elementary schools both receive ESEA, Title I support—one as the result of a substantial influx of students from low-

---

*Demographic data are taken from *Akron Public Schools/Community/Kent State University Urban Teacher Corps Project Proposal* (1978).

income families over the past five years. The total student population within the four schools is approximately 4,000; personnel based at the schools include more than 215 teachers, aides, and administrators.

Kent State University is a state-supported public institution of higher education, located in northeast Ohio within 50 miles of three metropolitan centers. More than 5 million people live within 50 miles of Kent State, which serves an enrollment of 28,000. Kent State is one of the largest of the more than 50 institutions in Ohio that offer preservice training for teachers. As of 1978, the College of Education included 174 full-time faculty members and enrolled 3,000 undergraduate students; about 500 advanced degrees were awarded by the Graduate School of Education during that year.

Triangulation as a Model of Collaboration. The conception of staff development reflected in project materials is the "professional understanding" described by Elliott (n.d.). Development is viewed as a self-regulating process of change in beliefs and conduct which occurs spontaneously once constraining factors are removed and the individual professional is allowed to reflect critically on his or her practice and to determine his or her own thoughts and actions in light of the standards and values held by the profession. The professional development system being put into place with support from the project incorporates: (1) systematic involvement of the three major stakeholder groups; (2) field-based training programs for preservice teacher education students, practicing teachers and other school-based personnel, and community members; and (3) a delivery system that utilizes a variety of training modes (workshops, curriculum development activities, demonstration classrooms, etc.).

In using the triangulation model as a device for facilitating information-based decision making regarding staff development, the project staff have retained several key features of Elliott's original model, including: (1) its focus on practical problems faced by teachers in the classroom; (2) its attention to development of collaborative relationships among teachers as well as between teachers and persons from outside the school; and (3) its use of multiple points of view to generate information, with no single view allowed to dominate. The staff have also modified the original approach in three ways: First, the focus of attention has been shifted from the classroom to the building level. Second, individuals actively involved in triangulation serve on working groups associated with each program component as representatives of a constituency. Third, rather than explicitly include the student's point of view, as Elliott did, the project has involved parents and community; thus, community, school, and university personnel constitute the three points in the triangle.

The triangulation process is carried out through a sequence consisting of three steps: (1) needs assessment, (2) planning, and (3) implementation. As each sequence is completed, the process is recycled such that additional concerns and priorities are identified and further staff development activities are planned and executed in response to these concerns. Each of the three primary stakeholder groups bears the major responsibility for identifying its own needs and formulating plans for appropriate staff development. The 17-member Community Council maintains primary responsibility for surveying the community and planning activities directed primarily to parents and community members, and teacher committees survey faculties at the four project schools.

Essentially, triangulation is the process through which communication and negotiation occurs across groups so that the information and resources represented by the diverse perspectives can be brought to bear on planning staff development. Project materials describe three ways in which the process strengthens the planning of inservice:

> First, the diagnosis of problems is built into every element of the program. The systematic reflection is the setting in which the problems are diagnosed. Second, the entire project experiences an on-going renewal process through the constant flow of information. With its beginnings in individual classrooms and at individual meetings, the change process involving behavior and beliefs pervades the entire structure of the project. Finally, misconceptions regarding the inservice mission of the Teacher Corps Project are quickly identified when information passes through the triangulation process. Definitions of the project's mission are always current and known to all three groups in the triad. These benefits from the implementation of triangulation come about because the process is collaborative rather than hierarchically structured.
>
> (Anglin & Patton, 1978, pp. 5-6)

Staff Development Activities. The types and content of staff development activities that have been implemented as part of the Akron/Kent State project have been varied. Activities during the 1979-80 school year included 12 courses offered through Kent State with credit available. Like all staff development activities sponsored by the project, these courses were open to all faculty and staff at the four Teacher Corps schools and to interested community members. Courses could be taken individually, with or without credit; however, the twelve courses together constituted the first half of a two-year field-based masters program. A series of mini-courses, also with university credit available but meeting for only two to three weeks, focused on such topics as job stress, the gifted child, Akron's pluralistic past, and stereotyping. Finally, a group of one-day workshops, without credit, included sessions examining great ideas in teaching, intra-school communication, parents and the school, and other topics. Instruction in the courses, mini-courses, and workshops is provided by teams of university-based teacher educators and school practitioners or administrators.

Enrollment in the courses and workshops has been higher than expected; according to project staff, half the faculty at the four project schools have enrolled in one or more credit courses. Project staff and teachers alike attribute the widespread response to the involvement of teachers in planning the programs. Teachers describe the staff development offerings provided through the project as "a good start" toward changing their view of inservice as something planned and implemented exclusively by outsiders and of little or no relevance to the classroom-based practitioner. Teachers who have been involved allude both to the new responsibility they take on when they help to plan inservice and to the difficulty they encountered in carrying out their new role at first. According to a high school teacher, "Teacher Corps is the first time anyone has asked us what we wanted. This has made it harder, because for a long time we didn't really know. If we don't answer this question well, the project will fail." Teachers who have participated in courses on such topics as job stress and chemical dependency describe these offerings as unique in their experience and as highly relevant both to issues they face on a daily basis in the classroom and to their longer-term personal and professional interests. Project staff note that practitioners' priorities for staff development have shifted somewhat over time from an early focus on practical issues—what to do in the classroom--to a growing interest in theoretical issues.

In addition to the coursework offerings described above, the project staff have pursued several other less formal modes of staff development. These include setting up demonstration classrooms, interclass visitations, and minigrants to teachers for curriculum development and classroom-based innovation. As part of the project's first-year emphasis on building a program integrated across the four schools and the full K-12 spectrum, teachers planned and implemented an exchange program, in which elementary and secondary teachers taught each other's classes for a day to develop a better understanding of differences in the teaching situation and the classroom environment across levels. According to project reports, what participating teachers discovered was that elementary and secondary classrooms were far more similar than they had believed.

As the project has moved into its second year of full operation (1980-81), interest in planning staff development to serve the full project community has continued. At the same time, however, new interest has emerged in addressing concerns and priorities unique to each of the participating schools. As such, some of the activities planned for the current year address building-specific themes; it is hoped that this will broaden faculty participation within each school and encourage school staff and the community served by the school to work more closely together.

Requirements for Collaboration. Kent State University and the Akron Public Schools did not have a history of collaboration prior to the early stages of planning for the Teacher Corps project in 1977. Project personnel agree that working relationships between members of the university, the schools, and the community have emerged slowly and are continuing to evolve. Project staff from the university cite as an important factor the relatively long period of pre-project planning (14 months) during which they worked closely with senior administrators in the district.

This period gave the university staff the opportunity to gain some familiarity with the school system's organizational structure, communication channels (formal and informal), norms, and operating procedures before beginning to collaborate with practitioners and community representatives directly. It also gave the district's senior administration the opportunity to get to know some of the university staff who were expected to play major roles in the project, under conditions of comparatively low visibility. To gain active support and concurrence at the district level, project staff argue, it is necessary to demonstrate to senior officials in the district office that collaboration with teachers and the community, which has not been standard operating procedure in the past, is consistent with the district's interests and produces some recognizable benefits. This has happened slowly, since staff have found that collaboration, particularly in its early stages, is a time-consuming approach to planning and recognizable benefits are slow to emerge.

A second factor that project staff regard as important to development of collaborative arrangements is clarification of the scope of collaboration at the outset. Project staff argue that it is not necessary, or even appropriate, to collaborate on all aspects of project operations. For administrative matters that require decisions to be made routinely and rapidly, triangulation or other collaborative approaches are simply not feasible. In the Akron/Kent project, triangulation has been used primarily as a vehicle for three-way deliberations regarding the conduct and content of staff development. Within this domain, some issues were recognized from the beginning as non-negotiable because of Teacher Corps program regulations and/or policies of the district and the university. Project participants agreed to work within the scope available to them. According to staff, the project's scope has broadened somewhat over time with additional clarification of Teacher Corps regulations and perceptions within the central office that staff development activities supported by the project have been well attended and well regarded by members of the schools and the community.

A third factor project staff cite as important is recognition that not all practitioners will want to collaborate in planning staff development.

Some resist the goal of professionalizing the teaching occupation. To be a professional suggests to them to work long hours and to assume full responsibility themselves both for the products of their efforts and for accepting or ameliorating the conditions under which they work. Some are faced with personal responsibilities and pressures that leave them little time or energy for additional activities. For these groups of teachers, participation in collaborative ventures that are ultimately directed toward job enlargement (gaining authority and responsibility for school decision making and management of the instructional process) is not an especially attractive option. Even for those teachers who are interested in assuming more direct and professional involvement in school decision making, collaboration—particularly with persons from outside the school (university professors, community council members)—is an unfamiliar activity. Their training has prepared them to work with children, not with other adults. Training and experience at using collaborative techniques are needed by these teachers.

A fourth requirement identified by project staff is validation of information obtained through traditional needs assessment surveys. The dialogue that emerges across university, school, and community stakeholders via triangulation is seen as important in helping to uncover the basic concerns and problems that lie behind responses to written surveys. An example comes from a needs survey conducted among teachers that identified discipline as a high priority for inservice. Discussions among teachers, and between teachers and university/community personnel revealed that what the teachers were concerned about was the lack of a well-articulated and widely understood discipline policy at their schools, which had created ambiguity for teachers, students, and parents and had led to apparent inequities in treatment of problems not resolved within the classroom. Obviously the staff development implications of this concern are quite different from the apparent implications of survey data suggesting that teachers want a course in "techniques for maintaining discipline in the classroom".

McKinley Complex Teacher Corps Project

This case presents an interesting application of practitioner involvement in the structuring and implementation of staff development (inservice) activities. The case is noteworthy since the techniques and procedures used in the project are dictated more by social conventions of the project community than by strong theoretical or programmatic considerations--yet in many ways they reflect the state-of-the-art in practitioner involvement applications. Furthermore, as this is a Program 78 Teacher Corps project (following on two previous years of Teacher Corps support), it should have fairly wide and direct relevance to those in the Teacher Corps community interested in practitioner involvement issues.

Case Description. The McKinley Complex project is a Program 78 Teacher Corps project serving the Honolulu educational community. It operated previously as the Jerrett Teacher Corps Project (1976-1978). The current project operates as a joint effort involving the Hawaii State Department of Education, the University of Hawaii at Manoa, the McKinley High School Complex, and a community council. The term "McKinley Complex" refers to the collection of Title I elementary and intermediate feeder schools which link to McKinley High School (also a Title I school). Three such schools are included in the Teacher Corps projects--Royal Elementary (K-6), Washington Intermediary (7-9), and McKinley High (10-12).

The composition of these project schools--and of the general community served by the Hawaiian educational system, can be characterized as truly multicultural. More than a dozen culturally distinct ethnic groups are served by the project schools.* Moreover, a substantial proportion of families immigrating to the state are enrolled in project schools. Fully one fourth of the pupils are from non-English-speaking families representing more than a dozen separate languages.

One response to this cultural and linguistic diversity has been the adoption of a practitioner involvement philosophy and modus operandi by the project leadership (project, district, university, and community stakeholders). Some of the applications emerging from this philosophy appear to represent the state-of-the-art, particularly with regard to inservice staff development and curriculum improvement.

---

*Honolulu District Office, 1977, pp. 52-54.

More specifically, the project recently completed the first phase of a practitioner-designed and implemented program to fine tune instructional skills and curricula to better fit the populations being served. Typically such curriculum and instructional reform is carried out by "experts" from outside the classroom or school. It is not conventional to find teachers participating in the process much beyond the completion of some needs assessment inventory. But the project leadership recognized that teachers need to be taught how to become involved--how to assume a role of responsibility for the quality and effectiveness of their efforts. The approach developed by the project to supply this "involvement training" should serve as a useful model for others who are interested in this outcome.

First, the project required each participating faculty to establish its own teacher cadre. Cadres consisted of a chairperson for each school and representatives from each department (or the faculty at large in the elementary school). The principal's participation was neither prohibited nor mandated--each school decided independently; the term of service on a given cadre was one year, and participation was voluntary. Subsequent (additional) cadre membership was determined by individual faculty interests. Cadres arranged for meetings in accordance with locally developed schedules.

On the first pass, the cadres were to lead their faculties in the design of successful inservice courses to meet their school-specific needs. In an effort to provide for maximum local involvement and participation, the Teacher Corps staff maintained a nondirective posture.[*]

The cadres' response to this approach was mixed. On the one hand, the faculties approved of their new roles and responsibilities. On the other hand, they soon recognized that they lacked the procedural skills needed to build issue consensus. They, in effect, requested more assistance from the project in the development of a process; a mechanism for solving some of the problems they sensed existed both at the instructional and organizational levels.

---

[*] A project report refers to this early effort as an attempt to apply Some Requirements for Successful Inservice Education (King et al., 1977). Among these, perhaps the most crucial are "...decisions on feasibility and prioritization of proposed inservice activities are made jointly by teachers and the resource persons..." and "resources needed for the inservice be committed and the rights/responsibilities of teachers are delineated." (Ching & Tendo, 1977).

Subsequently the project, with the concurrence of the Department of Education, has sponsored a sequence of inservice "retreats" which were open to the full participation of all teachers in the project schools. However, the school-based faculty have had the responsibility of planning and implementing these workshops, with the project staff providing resources and assistance as requested by the faculties.

The project reports the latest sequence of retreat workshops to have been reasonably successful, and has some interesting evidence to support this claim. This particular retreat was advertised as a two-week workshop "...work training in value and product development in orientation" (Case Study Document #4-22, emphasis in original). As incentives for participation, teachers were offered three University of Hawaii credits and a stipend, the latter being contingent upon completion of a product initiated through the workshop. Further, teachers were allowed three options: They could select an issue or area of individual interest, organize as a team or group around some specified topic, or participate in the workshop on a full faculty or departmental project basis.

One outcome of the proceedings was a consensus of teacher interest in building staff cohesion. As is noted in other case studies in this report, teachers are usually quite surprised to discover the extent of shared interests, concerns, and problems which overlap across faculties, particularly between elementary and secondary. Also, elementary faculty often learn a great deal of practical "how-to" as they compare problems and experiences in their own workshops. In this instance, the elementary school faculty have united with the principal in designing a detailed program for drawing the staff together into a more cohesive unit. Components of the plan include:

- periodic observation visits to each others' classrooms;
- the appointment of a task force to develop a student council to input student interests to teachers;

- the formation of a uniform behavior code and discipline policy;
- the development of a teachers' lounge which would be operated and maintained solely by the teachers; and
- a policy to observe each others' birthday.

Certainly none of these elements by itself is all that remarkable. Indeed, the collection may not appear particularly impressive against much of the innovation and school improvement rhetoric. The important point, however, is that the faculty are recognizing common interests and how to assume responsibility for dealing productively with these interests.

On a more academic level, the elementary faculty has undertaken the development and implementation of a fully articulated multigrade curriculum on science. This ambitious project stands a good chance of succeeding, particularly if progress toward building staff cohesion moves forward. However, current progress details were not available for this case report.

Another workshop outcome, one which cuts across the participating faculties, involves a two-workbook sequence for teaching Japanese as a second language. (Japanese is the dominant ethnic group in the project schools, constituting nearly one third of the enrollment.) This is viewed as an especially relevant multicultural outcome of the Teacher Corps project approach.

Critical Issues. Several issues believed important to the success of this approach to practitioner involvement were discussed by the project staff. First and foremost seems to be the role the principal plays in the total operation. To the extent project activities appear to interrupt or conflict with standard administrative procedures, or to challenge the authority of the principal, strong opposition can be expected. In this regard, the project staff made early efforts to involve the principals continuously in all phases of planning and subsequent operations. Principals were invited but not required to serve on steering committees. And care was taken to avoid producing additional administrative burden to principals through project operations.

Yet not all issues can be dealt with procedurally. Principals who see their administrative role threatened or who philosophically oppose this form of practitioner involvement (for whatever reasons) must be reckoned with. Quite frequently the new, inexperienced principal will respond cautiously, if not negatively, to these "unorthodox" approaches, which can have a chilling effect on staff enthusiasm. The project staff reported that in such situations a great deal of interaction with the principal may be needed to develop a more favorable orientation. The staff suggested that where the principal is strongly opposed, it may be useful to return to the beginning stages of planning, offering the principal a larger stake in the overall architecture. It appears, then, that a large share of the success of this form of practitioner involvement will depend upon principal-faculty rapport, and on effective interpersonal skills of the project staff in building upon this rapport. The principal is clearly the keystone.

A second critical issue regards assumptions of teachers' awareness of their needs. The project staff point out that teachers are dominated by a classroom perspective--they tend to focus on day-to-day demands and coping requirements of their respective classrooms. This seems to have two primary implications for success of practitioner involvement efforts. First, teachers have to be provided with a better picture of the arena--what is possible and available. Second, teachers have to be provided with group problem-solving skills--in part to overcome the effects of classroom isolation and in part to build bridges across the dispersed public school organizations. In effect, the staff argue that teachers need consciousness-raising activities to broaden their professional perspectives, and specialized training in the development of collaborative skills.

Related to this skill development, the project staff point to the use of social processes as a powerful tool. In particular, a crucial issue seems to be identifying and gaining the interest and support of informal opinion leaders in each faculty (or department). The staff report that these are usually high-energy people, easy to identify since they often participate in various community service activities. Such individuals usually endorse a practitioner involvement philosophy and need only the opportunity to exercise their leadership skills.

Which leads to the fourth crucial issue cited by the staff: namely a fairly adaptive action plan which involves a lot of personal interaction and hands-on skill training activities with the practitioners. The project staff report that they have learned to act primarily as facilitators—meeting among themselves almost on a daily basis to review and trouble-shoot progress and to initiate at least some action response to perceived problems. The essential point is that activity is continuous and adaptive. The practitioners require a lot of early evidence of their involvement--they are learning a new form or mode of behavior.

San Jose Teacher Involvement Project

This case describes an application of practitioner involvement centering on the role of teachers as instructional experts. The project goal was to increase the active participation and involvement of school-based faculty in the making and carrying out of instructional decisions in the classroom. The activities associated with this goal were supported by funds from the National Institute of Education and involved collaborative efforts of the state and local teachers' organization staff, the district administrative staff, and the instructional staff from 16 schools (elementary and secondary) in the district. The case is interesting in that many of the early themes and procedures pioneered in this project have been refined and incorporated into the Program 78 Teacher Corps project in the district. The case is particularly instructive regarding problems and advantages of this application of practitioner involvement, especially with respect to staff development and governance foci.

Context. The San Jose Teacher Involvement Project, or TIP, was initiated in September 1975, as one of nine urban school "self-help" projects awarded three-year grants by the NIE Local Problem Solving Program. The project was designed to provide school-based practitioners with opportunities and procedures for more direct participation in the development and management of instructional programs within their schools. The project was ostensibly targeted to inner-city schools serving economically disadvantaged populations. However, participation in the project was offered to any and all interested faculty in the district, and ultimately 16 school faculties became involved over the three-year project tenure.

The practitioner involvement issues which can be informed by this case are:

- the length of time and the complexity of procedures required to effect implementation of the project;
- the nature and extent of practitioner involvement developed by means of the project; and
- the initial (short-term) and sustained (long-term) effects of this involvement at the classroom, school, and district levels.

As this case was the most intensively studied and documented[*] of those included in this report, it has the potential to more completely inform the above issues.

Practitioner Involvement Rationale. The basic premise upon which TIP rested was a fairly straightforward extension of the organizational development model, combining notions of participatory management, role enhancement, and collaborative decision making within a professional development scheme.

It was reasoned that many of the creative and problem-solving resources represented by instructional staff were not utilized within schools, primarily because faculty had neither the opportunity nor the know-how to provide their input. This applied to both major and routine educational issues. The TIP approach was to provide interested practitioners with a means of developing the opportunities and cultivating their own skills for participating in decisions of interest to them. Such involvement should operate, among other things, to:

---

[*] Two documentation efforts were conducted concurrently during the four-year course of the project. The first was tailored to the project management and formative feedback needs (Emrick & Peterson, 1975, 1976, 1977 , 1978b). The second served the government's documentation/synthesis program objectives (Runkel, Schmuck, Arends, & Francisco, 1978).

(1) Enhance the relevance of information on which instructional decisions are based by bringing in the viewpoints and experiences of interested practitioners (ecological validity).

(2) Increase the range of alternatives to be considered in a given decision--hence enhancing the problem-solving capacity of the organization.

(3) Increase the commitment of practitioners to carry out decisions in which they participated.

(4) Enhance the professional identity, job satisfaction, and motivation of the involved faculty (improved organizational climate).

(5) Redistribute the administrative and instructional burden more equitably and improve local parity.

(6) Tap into the creative talent resident in the practitioner pool and create additional career and professional development opportunities among interested staff.

(7) Improve the basis for more effective interactions with parents and community interests.

Stage I: Initiation. Working through teacher organization contacts, the project leader/principal investigator secured a commitment of interest and willingness to participate from the local teacher organization administrators and several practitioners who had previously held office in the local organization. These practitioners were designated to serve as a Stage I steering committee; the local organization agreed to assist in setting up the administrative structure of the project. It was reasoned that this arrangement would render the project most clearly teacher oriented and administered.

Next the principal investigator and practitioner volunteers met with senior district administrators (the superintendent and two assistants) to present and discuss the project concept, with the objective of securing central administrative concurrence prior to application for government (NIE) funds. The central administration concurred, contingent upon unanimous concurrence by the building administrators whose staffs would be involved. (It is noteworthy that the decision to approve the project was heavily influenced by the superintendent, who openly expressed a participatory management philosophy and had initiated several earlier decentralization programs in the district.)

Stage II: Start Up and First-Year Implementation. With the road now clear, the principal investigator prepared a formal application for project support, and developed activity and time line sequences for first-year project implementation. A summary of the major activities of this first-year start up and implementation is as follows:

- An awareness mailing to all teachers in targeted buildings was conducted during the summer preceding the first project year. This material described the project philosophy and participation requirements in the most general terms and invited all interested teachers to attend an orientation meeting to obtain more details.
- Two orientation meetings were scheduled to provide for maximizing turnout. At the meetings the project director reviewed the philosophy and procedures for practitioner involvement, pointing to recent experiences in several other urban districts for validation of the concept and feasibility of the approach. A representative from the teacher organization delivered a motivational speech and members of the steering committee addressed individual concerns of the teachers.
- Using attendance at the orientation meeting as an indication of leadership and expression of concern, building involvement leadership triads were formed around the early volunteers. Their primary responsibility was to carry the message back to their respective buildings. The goal was to have a triad (three teachers) for each school building attend a training-workshop series to be implemented over the first project year.
- The start up workshop consisted of an audiovisual presentation and some preliminary skill development exercises in needs identification and priority setting.
- A more formal sequence of skill development workshops was implemented over the remaining academic year. The first of these provided formal training in issue identification and consensus building. The second dealt with differentiating the nature and level of involvement on consensual issues. A third workshop focused on the framing of faculty involvement constitutions, and a fourth workshop dealt with the establishment of a faculty council, ratification of the involvement constitutions, and application of the constitutional procedures to a real live issue (identified through earlier workshops).

By the close of the first year of project activities, several faculties had progressed to the final draft stages of their faculty involvement constitutions and were negotiating with their principals and faculties for ratification and application of the constitution to one or more issues. The majority of faculties, however, were stalled because of drafting difficulties, administrative negotiations, or competing demands and interests.

Stage III: Implementation and Refinement, Second Year. During the summer months, several changes in project organization were made by the principal investigator. First, members of the teacher consultant team were given a more substantial and formal role in project management. They now became the project directorate, with the principal investigator serving as a nonvoting member on the directorate team. Second, workshops were redesigned and segmented to better fit the needs and interests of elementary and secondary faculties in the project. Third, a new set of start up workshops was implemented for new faculties wanting to join the project. Fourth, a new modus operandi for the project leaders was adopted: This second year they were to spend substantially more time working at the building level, providing "hands-on" assistance to requesting faculties. This field orientation was well received by the participating faculties, but it required that two members of the directorate take leave from their teaching responsibilities to supply the on-site time required (their time was paid out of project funds).

Altogether five additional workshops were conducted during the second implementation year. As with the first-year workshops, these were fairly well attended, positively regarded, and apparently productive events. Part of the workshop success appeared due to good planning, format, and logistics. They usually started and ended on time, were tightly scheduled, involved a substantial amount of activity (much of it requiring cross-faculty teaming, progress sharing, reporting of war stories and their solutions). Another less tangible factor leading to the workshop success is believed to be their regard for and sensitivity to teacher interests and concerns—on both a personal and a professional level. The project leadership arranged in advance to provide fairly nice meals with the workshops. Faculty contributed their time as participants, and thus were given stakes in setting and carrying out agenda. Building and central office administrators, university staff, community (parent) representatives, teacher organization staff, and research professionals were almost always in attendance and were provided participatory roles integral to the workshop agenda. Prominent and influential presenters were often invited to address the participants on timely issues, to bolster morale, and to stimulate enthusiasm. And action items emanating from workshop proceedings were swiftly and conscientiously attended to, further reinforcing the emerging sense of efficacy engendered by the project.

By the close of the second year of skill-building workshops--most of which were refinements and extensions of the trial workshops conducted during the start up year--a real sense of progress existed. Over half the original faculties had drafted bona fide constitutions unique to their governance needs and interests, and several had been successfully applied to local issues. As an added resource, the project leadership allocated a modest portion of project funds to a teacher-owned and operated grants program. A participating faculty need only identify an application area through its constitutional process (usually some form of faculty senate) and request the project for support, in the form of a "mini-grant" application. The TIP directorate (the policy committee and project leadership) reviewed and recommended funding for these applications in terms of their merit. Usually funds were $500 or less. Some out-of-bounds requests were declined or referred for revision. But mostly the responses were positive and the grants component in may ways became a major incentive for initializing constitutions.

Stage IV: Project Stabilization and Institutionalization. In the third year, project leadership was assumed completely by classroom teachers. A consortium of six teachers (three of whom had been consultants during the first year) managed and directed the project. The local teacher organization provided physical space and limited administrative assistance, but by and large, the volunteer teachers ran the show. Attention shifted from development of skills in issue identification, consensus building, and constitution drafting more toward further expansion and solidification of the processes already initiated by the project. One focus was on diffusing the model to other schools in the district. Another was on disseminating success to other interested faculties outside the district. Several small conferences were convened and experts were retained to advise and consult on dissemination strategies.

Critical Issues. It is clear from TIP, as well as the other practitioner involvement applications reviewed above, that involvement takes time to emerge. Setting up faculty councils at TIP schools required one to two years. Provision was made for temporary involvement structures during the early initiation stage of activities; these interim involvement mechanisms included faculty members who were interested in setting up more permanent structures and willing to assume some responsibility for generating interest within their faculties.

Recruitment of volunteers in the first year did not always result in surfacing the true opinion leaders; however, interest was sufficient to form interim teams at about 80% of the target schools. In a report on the Urban/Rural program, an NIE-supported effort to establish councils of school personnel and community members to plan inservice education programs, Joyce (1978) describes a tendency among local project staff to recruit persons with leadership experience to serve on planning councils. While Joyce agrees that involvement of local leaders is important to gaining visibility and credibility, he recalls that the intent of the Urban/Rural program was to *develop* leadership and to bring previously disenfranchised groups into the decision process. A council consisting solely of "old boys," he argues, may be highly productive in the short run but dysfunctional over the long term. Where broader participation in governance is the goal, he argues that diversity and openness to persons who have not previously taken on leadership roles are important from the beginning.

Participation tended to be limited during the early stages of involvement and to grow with perceptions of success and with increased attention to school-level activities. As was true for other practitioner involvement applications reviewed here, various members of the groups targeted for involvement in TIP adopted a "wait and see" attitude, expressed skepticism that anything would change, and/or questioned the appropriateness of bringing teachers into the decision process. Many indicated that they simply did not have the time to get involved, given the many demands already made of them. However, as TIP activities became more visible within the participating schools, support for the concept of teacher involvement grew and participation increased. The proportion of teachers reporting broad-based support for the concept of teacher involvement in decision making more than doubled from the first year to the third, from 32% to 69% (Emrick & Peterson, 1977).

Another issue indicated by TIP and the other practitioner involvement applications is the importance of administrative concurrence and support. Practitioner involvement in decision making implies that administrators are asked to share their authority with individuals and groups who have relatively little experience in many of the areas where administrators consider themselves expert. Shared responsibility and greater cooperation in carrying out decisions may be the result, with benefits to administration. However, the conclusion reached by Joyce (1980) and his colleagues in their study of the Urban/Rural program that "sharing power increases power" (p. xiv) is not a self-evident truth to all administrators when the idea is proposed to them.

The importance of administrative support at both the district and the building level was demonstrated during the first year of TIP. The superintendent's support was demonstrated to teachers both by inclusion in the negotiated agreement between the teachers' organization and the district of a clause endorsing the establishment of school councils and by the superintendent's attendance at project functions. Support from building administrators was more problematic. Although official endorsement of the project by principals was obtained at the outset, teachers on the central project team originally opposed active participation of principals, on the grounds that "involvement" projects led by principals are characterized by tokenism, cooptation, and favoritism. Continuation of the project was threatened late in the first year when a coalition emerged of principals concerned that the project sought to undermine their authority as building managers. Only after the superintendent convened a meeting of principals and teacher representatives, where both sides could voice their opinions and concerns, were the issues resolved. Activities proceeded, with support and involvement solicited from principals.

A third issue involves variations in activities and progress across schools. Externally developed models and standardized procedures may be a useful way of getting started, since they provide an explicit structure within which the participants can gain early experience working together. The opinion polling procedures and consensus-building exercises that constituted a major component of TIP's early efforts, for example, represented a fairly low-energy means of obtaining information about faculty involvement priorities and of expanding the base of interest in setting up school councils beyond the original group of volunteers. However, as time passed, across-school differences became increasingly apparent, and more school-specific activities and assistance were used.* Obstacles to progress were in some cases similar across schools; however, they almost always had to be resolved on a case-by-case basis.

Reliance on externally developed models became a problem once faculties reached the point of preparing their constitutions. In several schools, teacher groups simply changed the school name on a model constitution, prepared in another district, that had been circulated as an example of language, format, and issue coverage. In each case, the constitution was summarily rejected by the principal on the grounds of artificiality and lack of suitability; the model constitution was not the product of the teachers' own thinking and planning for their school. Only after the various faculty groups went through the process of formulating their own school-specific constitutions were they accepted by principals and ratified by their respective faculties.

Fourth, practitioners' priorities for decision involvement tend to focus on management of the instructional process rather than on school administration. In three annual surveys, Emrick & Peterson (1977) asked teachers at TIP schools to identify their top priorities for faculty decision involvement. Results from the three surveys are displayed in the table below. Curriculum and instructional methods were consistently ranked as the top two priorities. Student personnel policies and discipline was also ranked consistently high.[*] Rankings for the other decision areas were also quite stable over the three-year period, with the exception of budget and expenditures, which advanced from sixth place to third after teachers were given control over small discretionary budgets.

---

*The tendency for project-wide activities to be predominant in the first year, with increased emphasis on school-specific activities in the second and subsequent years has also been noted in other contexts, including the Akron/Kent State Teacher Corps project discussed above, which also originated with a model developed in another setting (i.e., Elliott's triangulation model).

99

PRACTITIONER ENDORSEMENT OF MOST IMPORTANT INVOLVEMENT ISSUES
(Source: Emrick & Peterson, 1977)

Involvement Issue	Percent Endorsing as Most Important[**] 1975	1976	1977
Roles of certificated and classified support personnel	16.5 (7)	12.0 (7)	11.4 (7)
Guidelines for parent/teacher relationships	5.3 (8)	4.9 (8)	7.2 (8)
Curriculum content and philosophy	43.1 (1)	51.0 (1)	50.6 (1)
Instructional methods and grouping	32.8 (2)	33.7 (2)	39.8 (2)
Student personnel policies and discipline	29.8 (3)	27.7 (3)	21.7 (4)
School budget and expenditures	17.0 (6)	19.0 (6)	25.9 (3)
Inservice training and faculty meetings	25.3 (4)	21.7 (4)	19.3 (5)
Teacher personnel policies	24.9 (5)	20.7 (5)	16.3 (6)

The fifth issue regards practitioners' need for training in communication and decision-making skills, combined with assistance in resolving problems and conflicts as they arise. Training for participants was an important feature of the TIP program. Training in several areas was found useful, including: (1) techniques for identifying local needs and priorities and for reviewing progress toward accomplishing goals and objectives; (2) group process and communications skills such as running council meetings, ensuring that all participants provided input, building consensus, and working effectively with administrators and other groups; (3) human relations and conflict resolution; and (4) management skills, including preparation of proposals, guidelines for reviewing proposals, administration of budgets, and the like. Where training for councils members appeared to be successful, it was sequenced to correspond to participants' progress and priorities. Skills and techniques were presented in manageable doses, with the emphasis on activities that were relevant to resolving current problems and/or taking the next steps toward building involvement structures. Where training was less successful, it was frequently a problem of overload: Too much information or too many new techniques were introduced at once, or the material was related to activities too far down the line. Twice during the first two years of TIP it became necessary to make adjustments in the original, overly optimistic training schedule.

---

[*] One of the first items attended to by several faculty councils was development of school-wide discipline policies, spelled out in a handbook circulated to teachers, students, and parents. A similar concern was noted above at the Akron and Hawaii Teacher Corps projects.

[**] Respondents were aksed to select the two most important issues among those listed. Entries in parentheses ( ) indicate rank order of choice.

As indicated above, participants gradually assumed much of the responsibility for identifying their own training needs and priorities and came to look on each other as potential resources. The training agenda for the first year was determined by the central project team with almost no input from other teachers (except for feedback solicited at the end of workshops). By the second year the team received specific requests for training from several councils. In addition, teachers placed increasing importance on opportunities to share their progress and accomplishments with staff from other schools and to hear what problems had arisen in other settings and how they were being resolved.

A related phenomenon was the increasing sense of autonomy and local ownership of the process that evolved over the period of TIP initiation and implementation. By the end of the third year, almost two thirds of the teachers surveyed viewed support from the principal and "conditions unique to our school" as important to the success of teacher involvement efforts, and almost three fourths described district support as important.

The proportion of teachers who felt that additional training and assistance from outside sources was needed declined over the three years, with the exception of "troubleshooting" assistance that would be available on an as-requested basis.

Third-year ratings of TIP faculty councils' leadership qualities (in terms of seeking input, considering all views, and informing other faculty members of their activities and decisions) were very high. By the third year, two thirds of the teachers surveyed reported that their councils had been effective in increasing teacher involvement, and half reported that their own involvement in decisions had increased over the previous year. Substantial majorities reported that the councils had been involved in important issues and that the councils had produced positive impacts on school conditions and activities, leading to improvements in teacher effectiveness and student learning.

CHAPTER 6
SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

A central purpose of this investigation has been to illuminate and update the conventional knowledge of school practitioner involvement as it relates to practitioners' professional development. In carrying out this study (and organizing our findings), we have encountered a great deal of optimism and support for all the applications of practitioner involvement that we encountered. Virtually none of our practitioner advisors expressed regrets over their experiences in this form of collaboration. Rather the characteristic assessment was one of professional and personal growth, an enhanced sense of efficacy, increased job satisfaction, and improvements in morale accompanying experiences with practitioner involvement.

Anticipated Problems

Exactly how these positive subjective experiences translate into staff development and program improvements is far more problematic. Even more uncertain is the future for the concept of practitioner involvement. In light of the more or less successful applications we have described in this investigation, an analysis of current trends in American public education, particularly with regard to staff development and school improvement, suggests to us that general increases in practitioner involvement will be unlikely, or at best very slow in emerging. The reasons for this speculation are summarized below.

Incompatibility with Prevailing Norms. The active involvement of practitioners in most educational deliberations is simply not within current educational norms. Practitioner involvement rubs against the bureaucratic grains that have become so well established in contemporary administrative policy. Each instance of substantial and active involvement of practitioners reviewed in this investigation placed heavy demands on the operating system within which it occurred. To be sure, any change will introduce some of these stresses. But because practitioner involvement is, in essence, a redistribution of power, its change-induced stresses tend to be severe. It is usually through the extraordinary efforts of a dedicated few that practitioner involvement occurs at all.

What we are saying is that practitioner involvement appears to be fundamentally incompatible with current norms in educational administration. For whatever reasons (efficiency, economy, control, standardization), educational decision making has become increasingly centralized over the past 50-75 years. This centralization has moved decision making further and further from the participation of school-based practitioners. Efforts to reenfranchise practitioners in the decision process--whether for research and knowledge production, adaptation of knowledge to practice, or for issues of instruction and governance—involve a very large number of collateral and enabling change in the way schools currently operate. As these changes are difficult and costly, we can reasonably expect some reluctance to undertake them.

Lack of a Well-Developed Knowledge Base. Even if favorable changes in administrative norms and sentiments were somehow accomplished, it is clear from our investigation that very few practitioners currently possess the skills needed to increase collaboration and decision involvement. We have documented several successful efforts to develop such skills; this indicates that such an approach to staff development is feasible. Still, this experience is very recent, and too few precedents now exist to serve as a knowledge base for widespread application.

We hope that the findings from this investigation will inform the accumulating knowledge base and serve to guide future practitioner involvement activities. But our experience in studying the change process has taught us that the essential ingredients for complex change are not well communicated by print alone. Practitioners and administrators will require first-hand experience and extensive training in the mechanics of collaboration and decision involvement. The knowledge base for such skill development is only now emerging, and time will be needed for its further development and maturation.

Reluctance among Practitioners. Associated with the lack of a well-developed and codified knowledge base is a subtle but widespread reluctance on the part of most practitioners to undertake the extra work and risks that increased collaboration and decision involvement entail. Staff development activities purporting to change the roles and responsibilities of practitioners will be greeted with suspicion, especially in their early stages. Many practitioners simply do not want decision-making responsibility that extends beyond their classroom door. Others may welcome increased involvement, but will hesitate to engage in what appear to be power conflicts, particularly with the building principal. Still others are fundamentally distrustful of "staff improvement programs" designed and administered by non-practitioners.

Enabling Conditions for Practitioner Involvement. Our investigation has shown that special enabling conditions are needed to support the few "local opinion leaders" who become attracted to the concept and are willing to spend the additional time and effort required to develop collaborative skills and to lead other practitioners in implementing them. These conditions include:

- Explicit support for the concept and philosophy from senior administrative and governance authorities in the district. Without such explicit endorsement, collaboration can easily be mistaken for anarchy.
- Technical assistance in development of collaborative skills by experienced and knowledgeable experts who are conversant with the practitioner's perspective. Collaboration is not currently part of the norm within the teaching profession. Focused assistance in developing the know-how appears to be necessary.
- Provision of at least minimal facilities and resources for skill development and experience in practicing concepts of collaboration and decision involvement.* Prac-

---

*A major movement designed in part to provide the resources and facilities for increased practitioner involvement is the National Teachers' Centers program. While the Teachers Centers program was beyond the scope of this investigation, it is relevant to several of the issues being considered. Interested readers should become familiar with Kathleen Devaney and Lorraine Thorn's book, Exploring Teachers' Centers (1975), as well as materials published by the Teachers' Centers Exchange at Far West Lab.

titioners need places and times outside of normal operating schedules to meet and develop involvement skills.

- Practical and relevant issues for collaboration. Early experience in consensus building and priority setting appears useful, if not necessary. More importantly, practitioners have become cynical and can easily detect whether their involvement is genuine or if they are being "put on".
- Flexibility in school policy and procedures. Whatever the focus of practitioner involvement--knowledge production, use, or participation in instructional/governance decision making--early consequences will likely appear more disruptive than constructive. The status quo involving complex interrelationships of authority, responsibilities, and accountabilities will be undergoing some fundamental modifications. This will doubtless trigger resistance from vested interest groups, resulting in increased tensions throughout the local organizational structure. Foresight and preparation for these "byproducts" of the involvement process is needed if the effort is to survive its initial stages.

Need for Extended Commitment from Stakeholders. Progress in the emergence and stabilization of involvement mechanisms and procedures is typically slow, and evidence of tangible benefits is often difficult to demonstrate in terms of conventional evaluative criteria. These considerations suggest that an unusual and extended commitment of stakeholders will be needed to sustain practitioner involvement as a focus for staff development, particularly through the stormy conflicts which usually erupt during the first several years. Field experience to date indicates that three years or more are needed before the shift in norms represented by genuine practitioner involvement begins to stabilize within a school district. If commitment falters before the process becomes standard operating procedure, major setbacks will result. First-hand experience with at least one of these setbacks suggests that they can well signal the demise of the effort.

From the above considerations, one must conclude that there will be major difficulties in accomplishing rapid progress in so basic a reform. But because practitioner involvement in research and deliberations on the improvement of practice is so fundamentally essential to any educational improvement goal, these considerations must be viewed as basic costs and facts of life rather than as demerits of the concept. Moreover, on the plus side of the analysis, a number of attractive aspects can be identified.

The Plus Side

Much discussion in this investigation has dealt with problems of practitioner alientation and apathy, with the isolation produced by loosely coupled school organizations, with frustrations and disappointments regarding repeated failures of "solutions" to school problems, and with the insensitivity most interventions exhibit to the world of the practitioner. We have attempted to show how increases in practitioner involvement may well represent a productive approach to ameliorating these and other problems facing American public education. In the concluding paragraphs of this report, we review further these considerations and suggest steps which should enhance approaches to staff development through practitioner involvement.

Given the recency of systematic efforts to reenfranchise practitioners in the school improvement process, evidence of long-term benefits has not yet emerged. Some regularity in near-term benefits does suggest, however, that anticipated long-term advantages may equal or exceed expectations. These expectations include substantial improvements in:

- Collaboration and skill sharing among practitioners,
- Professional commitment to improvement of practice and programs, innovativeness, and local problem solving,
- Rapport and trust building between administrators and practitioners,
- Dialogue and deliberations between the school and the community,
- Basic effectiveness of schools,
- Status of teaching as an art, science, and profession, and
- Overall sense of efficacy among practitioners.

Improvements in practitioner collaboration and skill sharing have been evidenced in virtually all the practitioner involvement projects reviewed in this investigation. One of the first realities that practitioners discover in these activities is the pervasiveness of common concerns. These concerns appear to be quite practical and realistic rather than selfish or idealistic (as cynical observers of the profession would have us believe). One of the most widespread issues addressed through the collaborative process is classroom management. Practitioners are eager to negotiate with each other, with school administration, with research institutions, with parents and community representatives, with their professional organizations, and with pupils on how best to establish and implement consistent pupil/classroom management approaches. Moreover, when they become involved in these management-oriented deliberations, practitioners are surprisingly effective, usually arriving at a workable plan on the first or second pass.

Perhaps more importantly, it can be argued that classroom management and pupil discipline should be of prime concern. Even the most effective pedagogy will suffer if practitioners lack the skills and/or consensus on procedures for maintaining order and consistent discipline policies within and outside the classroom. What many practitioners discover is that parents, administrators, and pupils themselves are also eager for such consistency. Once established, even small improvements in these management skills act as stimuli for undertaking more basic reforms in curriculum and pedagogy. This, in turn, enhances a general sense of efficacy among practitioners and leads to increase cohesiveness and professional identity, which are precisely the goals of most staff development programs.

An equally important implication of findings from the practitioner involvement experiences reviewed in this investigation is the major shift in locus of control. Rather than being passive recipients of externally designed improvements, practitioners become active participants in problem-solving processes. The consequences of this are usually immediate, visible, and proportional to the effort expended. As progress toward improvements is realized, it serves as a catalyst and stimulus for further collaboration. The pattern of increased collaboration extends from practitioner to practitioner, gradually to include administration, community, and external (R&D) interests. It sets the stage for experimentation and innovativeness on the part of exceptional teachers, and for sharing improvements in the know-how which may result.

This outcome is especially important, since these exceptional staff represent the single most vital problem-solving and program improvement resource in today's schools. All major studies of school improvement show that success is determined by the few local leaders who have the motivation and capability to innovate and to risk change. Other studies suggest that if opportunities for achievement are not available to these exceptional staff, they may well seek them outside the profession. Increasing opportunities for all practitioners to participate in knowledge production, utilization, and instructional decision making/governance should act to retain this crucial resource for school improvement.

At a less abstract level of discussion, some of the near-term benefits of increased practitioner involvement should be of interest to school administrators and staff development program managers. Building principals from virtually all the projects studied in this investigation report that their administrative burden has been reduced and that their professional relationships with faculty have improved. Even principals who were initially threatened and/or strongly opposed to the concept report that more good than harm has resulted from the experience.

Similarly, both qualitative and quantitative aspects of inservice staff development programs which make genuine provision for practitioner input appear positive. Attendance increases and participation is more active, issue focused, and evenly distributed among the staff. Teachers report that they look forward to the inservice activities, that they are actively participating (often for the first time in their careers), that the issues have relevance to them, and that they are actually realizing something useful from the process.

REFERENCES

Akron Public Schools/Community, Kent State University Urban Teacher Corps Project Proposal. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University, 1978.

Amall, S. A social psychological investigation into university students' attitudes to their teachers' functions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University College, Swansea, 1978.

Amall, S., & Gruneberg, M. M. Students' knowledge of and attitudes to the research role of the lecturer. *Research In Education*, 1976, *17*, 77-82.

Ambrosie, F., & Heller, R. W. The secondary school administrators and perceived teacher participation in the decision-making process. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 1972, *40*(4), 6-13.

Anglin, L. W., & Patton, W. E. Collaborative planning of inservice education. Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, 1978.

Argyris, C. *Understanding organizational behavior*. Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1960.

Argyris, C. *Integrating the individual and the organization*. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Atkinson, J. W., & Feather, N. T. (Eds.). *A theory of achievement motivation*. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Atkinson, J. W., & Raynor, J. O. (Eds.). *Motivation and achievement*. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing Corp., 1974.

Atkinson, J. W., & Raynor, J. O. *Personality, motivation, and achievement*. New York: Halsted, 1978.

Bawden, R., Florio, S., & Wanous, D. Learning from teachers: Lessons about professional development drawn from teacher participation in research and evaluation. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Belasco, J. A., & Alutto, J. A. Decisional participation and teacher satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1972, *8*(1), 44-58.

Berman, P. Testimony to the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1977.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. *Federal programs supporting educational change. Vol. IV: The findings in review*. R-1589/4-HEW. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1975.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Implementation of educational innovation. Educational Forum, 1976, 40(3), 347-370.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal programs supporting educational change. Vol. VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation. R-1589/7-HEW. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1977.

Bridges, E. M. Teacher participation in decision making. Administrator's Notebook, 1964, 12(9).

Bush, R. N. A new source of energy for teacher education: Collaboration. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.). Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: University of Texas, R&D Center for Teacher Education, 1980.

Bussis, A. M. Collaboration for what? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Bussis, A. M., Chittenden, E. A., & Amarel, M. Beyond surface curriculum. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1976.

Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., and Weik, K. E. Managerial behavior, performance and effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill, 1970.

Carini, P. F. Documentary processes. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978a.

Carini, P. F. The child as reader. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 1978b.

Carini, P. F. The art of seeing and the visibility of the person. Grand Forks: University of North Dakota Press, 1979.

Chase, F. S. The teacher and policy making: How democratic can you get? Administrator's Notebook, 1952, 1(1).

Chein, I., Cook, S. W., & Harding, J. The field of action research. American Psychologist, 1948, 3, 43-50.

Ching, D., & Tando, E. An inservice course designed by teachers. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1977.

Chittenden, E. A., & Bussis, A. M. The teacher as research collaborator. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

Clegg, A., Anglin, L. W., & Patton, W. Triangulation: A strategy for formative action research on in-service education. Paper presented at second annual meeting of the Research and Development Association for Education, Alexandria, VA, November 1978.

Cope, E., & Gray, J. Teachers as researchers: Some experience of an alternative paradigm. British Educational Research Journal, 1979, 5(2), 237-251.

Corey, S. M. Action research, fundamental research and educational practices. Teachers College Record, 1948, 50, 509-514.

Corwin, R. G. Models of educational organizations. In F. N. Kerlinger (Ed.). Review of research in education, Vol. 2. Itsaca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1974.

Cresswell, A. M., & Murphy, M. J. Teachers, unions, and collective bargaining in public education. Berkeley: McCutcheon, 1980.

Cronbach, L. J. Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 1975, 30(2), 116-127.

Devaney, K., & Thorn, L. Exploring teachers' centers. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975.

DeVault, M. V. Research and the classroom teacher. Teachers College Record, 1965, 211-216.

Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: MacMillan, 1963.

Doyle, W. Learning the classroom environment: An ecological analysis. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28(6), 51-55.

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. A. The practicality ethic in teacher decision-making. Interchange, 1977, 8(3), 1-12.

Dunnette, M. D. (Ed.). Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Elliott, J. Evaluating inservice activities: From above or below? Cambridge Institute of Education, Cambridge, England, no date.

Elliott, J. Objectivity, ideology, and teacher participation in educational research. Cambridge Institute of Education, Cambridge, England, 1975.

Elliott, J. Developing hypotheses about classrooms from teachers' practical constructs: An account of the work of the Ford Teaching Project. Interchange, 1977, 7(2), 2-22.

Emrick, J. A., & Peterson, S. M. Evaluation of phase I of the San Jose Teacher Involvement Project, Vol. I: Findings and recommendations. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1975.

Emrick, J. A., & Peterson, S. M. Evaluation of phase II of the San Jose Teacher Involvement Project, September 1975-August 1976: Findings and recommendations. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1976.

Emrick, J. A., & Peterson, S. M. Evaluation of phase III of the San Jose Teacher Involvement Project: Findings and recommendations. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.

Emrick, J. A., & Peterson, S. M. A synthesis of findings across five recent studies of educational dissemination and change. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1978a.

Emrick, J. A., & Peterson, S. M. Final Report: Follow-up evaluation of the San Jose Teacher Involvement Project. Los Altos, CA: John A. Emrick & Associates, 1978b.

Emrick, J. A., with Peterson, S. M., & Agarwala-Rogers, R. Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network, Vol. I: Findings and recommendations. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institue, 1977.

Feiman-Nemser, S. Growth and reflection as aims in teacher education: Directions for research. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.). Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: University of Texas, R&D Center for Teacher Education, 1980.

Fox, G. T., Jr. Generating knowledge from field experience: Two competing conclusions about potential teacher center support. High School Journal, 1978, 186-209.

Fullan, M., & Pomfret, A. Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of Educational Research, 1977, 47(2), 335-397.

Goodlad, J. L., Klein, M. F., & Associates. Looking behind the classroom door. Worthington, Ohio: C. A. Jones Publishing Co., 1974.

Gorton, R. A. Factors which are associated with the principal's behavior in encouraging teacher participation in school decision-making. Journal of Educational Research, 1971, 64(7), 325-327.

Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. B., & Bernstein, M. Implementing organizational innovations: A sociological analysis of planned educational change. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Gruneberg, N. M. Understanding job satisfaction. New York: Wiley, 1979.

Hall, G. E., George, A. A., & Rutherford, W. L. Measuring stages of concern about the innovation: A manual for use of the SoC questionnaire. Austin: University of Texas, R&D Center for Teacher Education, 1977.

Herzberg, F. Work and the nature of man. New York: World, 1966.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. The motivation to work. New York: Wiley, 1957.

Honolulu District Office, Compensatory Education. The 1977-78 Alternative Program Catalog. Honolulu: author, 1977.

Hornstein, H. A., Callahan, D. M., Fisch, E., & Benedict, B. A. Influence and satisfaction in organizations: A replication. Sociology of education, 1968, 41(4), 380-389.

Houston, W. R. Collaboration--see 'treason'. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.). Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: University of Texas, R&D Center for Teacher Education, 1980.

Howey, K. R. School-focused inservice teacher education: Implications for research and development. Paper presented at Teacher Education/Staff Development Research Symposium, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, July 1980.

Hulin, C. L., & Blood, M. R. Job enlargement, individual differences and worker responses. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 69, 41-65.

Isherwood, G. B., & Taylor, R. M. Participatory decision making via school councils. High School Journal, 1978, 255-270.

Joyce, B. R, (Ed.). Involvement: A study of shared governance of inservice teacher education. Syracuse: National Dissemination Center, Syracuse University, 1978.

King, J. C., Hayes, P. C., & Newman, I. Some requirements for successful inservice education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 58, 686-687.

Kirby, P. W. Inservice education: The university's role. Educational Leadership, 1973, 30(5), 431-433.

Korman, A. K. Organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Krathwohl, D. R. An analysis of the perceived ineffectiveness of educational research and some recommendations. Educational Psychologist, 1974, 11(2), 73-86.

Lieberman, M. Education as a profession. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Locke, E. A. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.). Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Lortie, D. C. The balance of control and autonomy in elementary school teaching. In A. Etzioni (Ed.). The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers. New York: Free Press, 1969.

Lortie, D. C. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Loucks, S. F., Newlove, B. W., & Hall, G. E. *Measuring levels of use of the innovation: A manual for trainers, interviewers, and raters.* Austin: University of Texas, R&D Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

Louis, K. S. Products and process: Some preliminary findings from the R&D Utilization Program and their implications for federal dissemination policies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Louis, K. S., & Sieber, S. D. *Bureaucracy and the dispersed organization*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1979.

MacDonald, B. Evaluation and the control of education. In B. MacDonald & R. Walker (Eds.). *SAFARI: Innovation, evaluation, research and the problem of control*. Norwich, England: Centre of Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia, 1974.

Maehr, M. L., & Sjogren, D. D. Atkinson's theory of achievement motivation. First step toward a theory of academic motivation? *Review of Educational Research*, 1971, *41*(2), 143-161.

Maslow, A. H. *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.

Maslow, A. H. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 1974, *50*, 370-396.

McClelland, D. C. *The achieving society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand (1961).

McGregor, Douglas. The human side of enterprise. 1960.

McLaughlin, M. W. Implementation as mutual adaptation: Change in classroom organization. *Teachers College Record*, 1977, *77*(3), 339-351.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Marsh, D. D. Staff development and school change. *Teachers College Record*, 1978, *80*(1), 69-94.

Mescon, M., & Rachman, D. *Business today*. New York: Random House, 1976.

Miles, M. B. Educational innovation: The nature of the problem. In M. B. Miles (Ed.). *Innovation in education*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1964.

Mishler, E. G. Meaning in context: Is there any other kind? *Harvard Educational Review*, 1979, 49(1), 1-19.

Mohrman, A. M., Jr., Cooke, R. A., & Mohrman, S. A. Participation in decision making: A multidimensional perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1978, *14*(1), 13-29.

Moore, D. R., et al. *Assistance strategies of six groups that facilitate educational change at the school/community level* (3 vols). Chicago: Center for New Schools, 1977.

Mort, P. R. The Metropolitan School Study Council--a new pattern in school cooperation. *The Educational Forum*, 1945, *9*(4), 413-417.

Nolan, R. R., & Roper, S. S. Translating research into practice: Suggestions for working with practitioners. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.

Peters, R. S. Must an educator have an aim? In Macmillan & Nelson (Eds.). *Concepts of teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.

Pincus, J. Incentives for innovation in the public schools. *Review of Educational Research*, 1974, *44*(1), 113-143.

Pritchard, R. D., Dunnette, M. D., & Jorgenson, D. O. Effects of perceptions of equity and inequity on worker performance and satisfaction. *Applied Psychology*, 1972, *56*, 75-94.

Prospect Archive and Center for Education and Research. *Descriptive documentary processes and formats*. North Bennington, VT: author, 1980.

Prospect School. *The Prospect School teacher education program*, 1979-1980. North Bennington, VT: author, 1979.

Reilly, V. E., & Dembo, M. H. Teachers' views of inservice education: A question of confidence. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1975, *57*(2), 126.

Rogers, E. M., with Shoemaker, F. F. *Communication of innovations: A cross-cultural approach*. New York: Free Press, 1971.

Runkel, P. J., Schmuck, R. A., Arends, J. H., & Francisco, R. P. *Transforming problems in urban schools into a capacity for solving problems*. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy & Management, 1978.

Schachtel, E. *Metamorphosis*. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Sharma, C. L. Who should make what decisions. *Administrator's Notebook*, 1955, *3*(8).

Sieber, S. D. Images of the practitioner and strategies of educational change. *Sociology of Education*, 1972, *45*, 362-385.

Sieber, S. D. Trends in diffusion research: Knowledge utilization. Viewpoints, 1974, 50(3), 61-81.

Sieber, S. D., Louis, K. S., & Metzger, L. The use of educational knowledge: Evaluation of the Pilot State Dissemination Program (2 vols.). New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1972.

Smith, L. M., & Keith, P. M. Anatomy of educational innovation: An organizational analysis of an elementary school. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Sprinthall, N. A. Adults as learners: A developmental perspective. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.). Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: University of Texas, R&D Center for Teacher Education, 1980.

Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., & Griffin, G. A. Interactive research and development on teaching study: Final report. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.

Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., & Lazar, C. Partners: Teachers, researchers, trainers/developers--an interactive approach to teacher education R&D. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.). Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: University of Texas, R&D Center for Teacher Education, 1980.

Tunnell, G. B. Three dimensions of naturalness: An expanded definition of field research. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 54(3), 426-427.

Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Wann, K. D. Teachers as researchers. Educational Leadership, 1952, 9, 489-495.

Ward, B. A., & Tikunoff, W. J. An interactive model of research and development in teaching. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1976.

Weick, K. E. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, 1-18.

Wrightstone, J. W. Research-action programs for research bureaus. Journal of Educational Research, 1949, 42(8), 623-629.

Yarger, S. M., Howey, K. R., & Joyce, B. R. Inservice teacher education. Palo Alto, CA: Booksend Laboratory, 1980.